ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

271.5 T19h
Taunton 1225279
History of the Jesuits in England,1580-1773

ANNEX

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

STO

ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

ANNEX

THE JESUITS IN ENGLAND

ROBERT PARSONS, S.J.

1546–1610

THE HISTORY OF THE JESUITS IN ENGLAND

1580–1773

BY

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON

AUTHOR OF

"THE ENGLISH BLACK MONKS OF ST. BENEDICT" ETC.

WITH TWELVE ILLUSTRATIONS

271.5
T19h

METHUEN & CO.

36 ESSEX STREET W.C.

LONDON

1901

1225279

TO

Z. MENNELL, Esq.

M.R.C.S. (ENG.), ETC. ETC.

BEST AND KINDEST OF DOCTORS

PREFACE

IN this book I deal with the subject of the Jesuits only so far as they belong to English History. With their purely domestic affairs I have but little to do; and only touch upon them in so far as they may be necessary for understanding the formation and ideals of men who set out to accomplish a definite work. It therefore enters into the scope of this work to attempt to discover the end they aimed at, and the means they employed to advance it. The subject of the English Jesuits demands study. It is necessary for a full understanding of certain episodes in English History; and the bearing on the general subject of what may at first seem to be despicable ecclesiastical squabbles, that is to say the struggles between the Jesuits and the Clergy, is seen to be profoundly important when the principle beneath the dispute is laid bare. Besides the question of the mutual relations of the principles of Authority and Personality which must affect the well-being of any State, the Clergy were sufferers for Patriotism. The Jesuits, as a body, stood for the Catholic Reaction, from first to last, a political expedient. The Clergy, on the other hand, contented themselves with the cause of Religion.

It is strange that hitherto the subject of the English Jesuits has been practically left untouched. More's Latin History has never been translated; but perhaps his indiscreet admissions may account for the neglect. Foley's eight volumes of *Records* cannot be taken as a history of the body to which he belonged. They are only a collection or, rather, selection

of documents. Foley's value consists almost as much in his omissions as in his admissions. And I am bound to remark that I have found him, at a critical point, quietly leaving out, without any signs of omission, an essential part of a document which was adverse to his case. His volumes of *Records* cannot, I regret to have to say it openly, be taken as trustworthy, unless corroborated by more scrupulous writers.

Still stranger is it that no adequate Life of Robert Parsons has been attempted either by his Society or anyone else. And yet he played no small part in the history of his times. During his lifetime, and for a short period after it, the Jesuits came into contact with the making of English history. In the eyes of the world Parsons was their one great man; and now, with the exception of Henry Garnet and Edward Petre, there is hardly the name of another English Jesuit known to the ordinary reader. And I do not think this general estimate is wrong. The personality of Robert Parsons overshadows the whole book; for, as a matter of fact, he is the History of the English Jesuits; and his successors, men of but little originality of their own, were content, when they had the chance, to put into practice what his fertile brain had conceived as desirable.

I venture to think I have found the key to his character. Puritanism certainly at one time influenced him; and his after-life shows how strong in him was this bias. Now Puritanism, which I take it is not so much a religious as a mental attitude, gives a consistency to his life and to the efforts of those who set themselves to carry out his policy. I may add I did not approach the subject with this theory in my mind; and it was not until I had the facts of the case before me that I realised the importance of the Puritan episodes in Parsons' life at Oxford.

There is, however, another side to the story of the English Jesuits, and it is one I have been careful to point out

While Parsons and his followers only succeeded in achieving a brilliant failure, they were acute enough to snatch the credit of Campion, Southwell, Thomas Garnett and others, who did the better and more fitting work. These, it seems to me, are the true heroes of the Society in England. Their lives and aspirations were pure and Christlike. They were men devoted to what they considered the work of the Gospel; and with the earnest cry of their life's blood pleaded for the rights of conscience.

I am prepared to hear regrets that I have introduced what some may call "contentious matter." This is unavoidable, and must, in the interests of truth, be approached with fearless steps. The fact of the case is, that the history of the English Jesuits is, in the main, one long contention. And if to-day are still felt the effects of disputes which began in the sixteenth century, it surely makes for peace to know the cause. I have felt considerably at times an inclination to get relief from the task I accepted; and it has been only the serious nature of the principles at stake that has enabled me to carry it on to completion. It is very often the case that principles are best studied when they are seen at work on a small stage; for then the real methods and ways appear, and the attention of the observer is not distracted by a multiplicity of details which may or may not have a vital connection with the agencies at work. And because the stage to which I invite the reader's attention is small, I must ask that this book be taken as a whole, and so judged; for each detail is only seen in its true light when considered in its relation to the complete story. This much I will say for myself. I have tried to follow one of Robert Parsons' own sayings: "A man is to be judged, not by words, but by deeds, which have the truest weight of affection or disaffection." Hence I have not always been able to accept the estimates of Jesuit writers such as More or Foley, Constable or Plowden, to say nothing of Jouvency, Tanner,

and Bartoli. With strict impartiality I have weighed what they had to say, but often found that they have not taken into consideration the forcible logic of facts. Domestic affection and a certain timidity in judging their superiors are, perhaps, in themselves admirable qualities in the Society but they are not such in historians. Indeed, one of these writers naïvely remarks that, "a too keen feeling of that natural partiality which attaches individuals to their own Society . . . always compensates by a thousand advantages the transitory diminution of good which it sometimes occasions." In view of such writers one is reminded of the saying that while few bodies of men have met with such opposition and hatred as the Jesuits, few have suffered more from the adulation of friends.

It has been my endeavour to steer clear of these extremes. We profess to want Truth; and Truth is not served by party spirit. Hence I neither suppress anything nor explain anything away; but, as far as possible, I have thought it well to allow the actors to tell their story in their own words. In order to be unhampered with obligations, I have preferred to work, almost entirely, from authorities manuscript or printed, which are within easy reach of the public. In these days when archives are opened to all, an abundance of light is poured in on historical matters, and an author can proceed with a firm and sure hand in unravelling the Records of the Past.

E. L. T.

LONDON, *October* 17, 1900.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
CHAPTER I	
THE ORIGIN OF THE SOCIETY	1–13
CHAPTER II	
ROBERT PARSONS	14–25
CHAPTER III	
PARSONS JOINS THE SOCIETY	26–46
CHAPTER IV	
THE JESUIT MISSION	47–85
CHAPTER V	
PLOTS AND SCHEMES	86–129
CHAPTER VI	
AT WORK IN SPAIN	130–154
CHAPTER VII	
BROILS IN ENGLAND, ROME, AND FLANDERS	155–198
CHAPTER VIII	
PARSONS "IN CURIÂ"	199–243
CHAPTER IX	
SUBJUGATING THE CLERGY	244–273
CHAPTER X	
THE GUNPOWDER PLOT	274–331
CHAPTER XI	
BREAKING THE BARRIERS	332–350

CHAPTER XII

PAGE

THE OATH 351–365

CHAPTER XIII

A LIFE'S TRAGEDY 366–396

CHAPTER XIV

THE TURNING OF THE TIDE 397–432

CHAPTER XV

THE GOLDEN DAY 433–461

CHAPTER XVI

FAILURE 462–474

APPENDIX 475–496

INDEX 497–513

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

PAGE

ROBERT PARSONS . . . . . *Frontispiece*

ST. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA 27

EDMUND CAMPION 83

CLAUDE AQUAVIVA 131

SOCIETATIS FUNCTIONES 153

REGNORUM ET PROVINCIARUM PER SOCIETATEM CONVERSIO . 233

HENRY GARNETT 274

HINDLIP HOUSE 306

A TRUE NARRATIVE OF THE HORRID HELLISH POPISH PLOT 440

EDWARD PETRE 461

THE COLLEGE AT ST. OMER 472

THE ENGLISH JESUITS

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGIN OF THE SOCIETY

IN 1378 Christendom met with a blow which shook it to the very foundations. Weakened already by the seventy years' captivity of Avignon, where the chief Pastor was looked upon, practically, as the tool of France, when Gregory XI. broke his gilded chain and set his face towards the Eternal City, the Papacy had, as the world might judge, a desperate future before it. The election of his successor, Urban VI., was, within a few months, opposed by some of the cardinals who had given him their votes. An antipope was set up; and thus began the Great Schism which, lasting for thirty-nine years, did much to make the Reformation possible.

And in this way. As Pope after Pope was met by an antipope, Christian Europe was distracted by rival claims. While Germany, England, and Italy held to the Roman line, France, Naples, Savoy, Castile, Aragon, Navarre, Scotland, and Lorraine recognised the opponents who sat at Avignon. Evils were inevitable; and became apparent in two great forms. The principle of Authority, which had hitherto bound men to the Pope as the centre of Unity, became weakened. Nay, it was even now set upon a wrong basis. No longer were the divine Promises made the ground of the claim to obedience; but both parties relied on the recognition of the States, and counted themselves specially fortunate if supported by any of the great institutions of learning.

The second form the evil took was that Morality was set

at naught in the high places, and the practice of the Gospel was in danger of being forgotten by its teachers. The *Libido dominandi* against which St. Bernard had warned Pope Eugenius, seems to have at last overpowered every other consideration. The Kingdom of this world was set up above the Kingdom of heaven. For years discontent had existed among the flock. The rapacity of the Papal *Curia*, and the exactions made in all countries for the benefit of foreigners, had caused bitter complaints. Temporal pretensions were claimed as spiritual rights; and men found it hard to draw the line which ought to be clear and distinct between the two. Loud cries went up from a distracted Christendom. Many were the attempts to bring about a reunion. Saints sighed, and the Church mourned her unworthy pastors. It was seen by all good men that there was needed a Reformation that would touch not only the members but also the head; for the whole body was diseased. The wiser thinkers of the day, while keeping inviolate the spiritual prerogatives of the Vicar of Christ, saw clearly that his true position was endangered by the abuses he had allowed to surround him. It did not require much foresight to know if these were allowed to continue, the result would be that the office itself could be attacked. Men will not go on for ever distinguishing between the office and the person. This is always an effort; and if for too long a period patience be strained to the snapping-point, it must at last give way.

The desperate disease called for a desperate remedy. A Council without a head was convoked by the cardinals of either party in 1409 at Pisa, wherein it was decreed: that the shameless misconduct and excesses of both claimants were notorious, and that as scandal was imminent and delay might be dangerous, immediate action should be taken against them. In due course both claimants were declared perjured and cut off from the Church,[1] and another Pope (Alexander V.) was elected. The only result of this measure was that now three Popes, instead of two, held the field. The whole theory of government was upset, and men began to mistake the very nature of the Church. The body was put before the head, whereas the two are inseparable. From its very nature the

[1] Cf. Labbe, *Concil.*, vol. xxvi. pp. 1218–19.

Church is not above the Pope, nor is the Pope above the Church; for the head can only act through the body, which, in its turn, can only exist in union with the head.[1] It was natural that this point should have been lost sight of in the miseries of times which were unprecedented and abnormal. Gerson, the famous Chancellor of Paris, says[2] that it was the confused state of opinions consequent upon a period of protracted schism, that brought the Council to set aside the doctrine of papal supremacy which had hitherto been universally admitted. But there it was; and perhaps it was providentially arranged that it should be made clear that the position of the Pope was not independent of the Church; for the head cannot be independent of the body. The action of this Council explains the attitudes taken up in after years by Popes and their opponents. Another Council was called at Constance [1414], which succeeded in securing the submission of the rivals and the acceptance of Martin V. by all parties. Thus was the Schism closed; but the work of reform went on more slowly. The genuine efforts of such Popes as Martin V. and Nicholas V. were rendered nugatory by the Italians at the *Curia*, "whose incomes in great part depended upon abuses, and who accordingly like a leaden weight impeded every movement in the direction of reform."[3]

But after the Council of Basle [1431–1443], another of these abortive attempts to remedy the state of the Church, had attacked the papal prerogative itself, the greatest Pope of the period Nicholas V. [1447–1455], was not slow to see that Rome had given cause for the prevailing discontent. The principle of centralisation, so typical of the Latin races, had been carried too far, and had become a legitimate reason for complaint. He said in answer to Æneas Sylvius (afterwards Pope Pius II.), the German ambassador of Frederick II.: "It seems to me that the Popes have extended their authority too far and have left no jurisdiction to the other bishops. The fathers of Basle have also gone too far in restricting the

[1] In a certain sense the Church can be said to be above the Pope, for a Pope who becomes a heretic can be deposed.

[2] *Joannis Gersonii . . . opera* (ed. Paris, 1606), pars i. p. 127.

[3] Pastor's *Lives of the Popes* (ed. English), ii. p. 48.

authority of the Pope. When one sets out with conduct un worthy of himself and unbecoming his office, he must expec to be eventually the victim of injustice, just as a tree that inclined too much to one side is, in the righting, often dragge too much to the other. For my own part I have firmly pur posed not to invade the legitimate rights of bishops. There but one way to preserve inviolate our authority, and that to respect to the full the authority of others."[1]

The successors of this wise pontiff did not follow his policy but, having once established themselves, resumed their claim and quietly shelved all questions of reform. Such Popes a Alexander VI. now held the Chair of Peter; and Simony an Immorality along with them. Despised by the kings of th earth, the Popes were once more the puppets of rival politica factions, and sought, by setting one power against another, t secure their own political ends.[2]

Was it then any wonder that the principle of authorit being weakened by schism, evil living, and abuses of powe tended to lessen in men's minds the appreciation of the Divi Ideal?

When estimating the circumstances which led to th foundation of the Jesuit Society, we must not forget to tak into consideration a movement which was a great force i moulding the history of the times. The law of Death is th law of Life; and from disintegration come new forms. So was with Christendom at large. It had grown old and sic during the past thousand years. It awaited a new birth. Th Renascence, which was hurried on by the fall of Co stantinople [1453], increased the facilities for a revival learning. In the passing away of the Middle Ages, a

[1] Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, iii. 2. 895.

[2] J. A. Symonds in his *Renaissance in Italy* (*Catholic Reaction*) says acute "It was the chief objects of the Popes, after they were freed from the pressing pe of General Councils, and were once more settled in their capital and recognised sovereigns by the European Powers, to subdue their vassals and consolidate th provinces into a homogeneous kingdom. This plan was conceived and carried by vigorous and unscrupulous pontiffs—Sixtus IV., Alexander VI., Julius II., Leo X.—throughout the period of distracting foreign wars which agitated Ita They followed for the most part one line of policy, which was to place the wea and authority of the Holy See at the disposal of their relatives, Riarios, D Roveres, Borgias, and Medici" (i. p. 6).

the enthusiasm begotten of the dreams of a Golden Age, men were carried beyond the limits of reason. There was a natural rebound from the old formalities and chains which had fettered the intellect. The classics of ancient Greece were now displaying their charms to men wearied with the barren speculations which had occupied so many wrangling and jarring schoolmen. Minds were thrown back upon antiquity. The very joyousness of life, too often in its most pagan form, seized upon men. Fortunately, such Popes as Nicholas v. saw the good in the movement and were wise enough, while encouraging it, to direct the tide into the service of Christianity. But with others it became a mere rampant Paganism. The heavenly was swallowed up in the earthly, and Jove of Olympus was set up in the place of the Christ of Nazareth.

To the English Benedictine monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, we owe the first beginnings of the revival of Greek in this country. Already had the Greek Emperor Manuel been a guest of the monks [1400], and in 1464 William Selling, a monk of that house, was sent for three years to Italy for the purpose of studying the classics. After his return he established a Greek school at Canterbury.[1] Fortunately the movement was at first guided by such earnest and pious Churchmen as Warham of Canterbury and Colet of St. Paul's. The great Cardinal of York, Wolsey, also was convinced that the Church must rise to the occasion. He sought by education, in his foundations at Ipswich and Oxford, to put a barrier in the way of wayward and uncontrolled intellect. His master-mind grasped the principle that learning, true and solid, had a work to do in helping men to love the Lord their God with their whole heart, with their whole soul, with all their strength, and with all their mind. He knew, too, that Ignorance was the fruitful mother of Superstition, whence came so many of the evils of the day. So in England the effects of the Renascence did not, as a whole, go beyond Christianity. Learning and Art received an impetus, and the throb of life went through the whole body politic.

Other countries were not so fortunate. Its tendency at Rome, for instance, under the papacy of Leo X., was, on one

[1] Gasquet, *The Eve of the Reformation*, pp. 24–38.

hand, to harden, and, on the other, to give a careless and contemptuous tone. The beauties of a recently discovered antique, or a set of polished verses, were practically considered of greater moment than either the salvation of souls or the removal of scandals. It may be held that this blindness to the real meaning of the New Birth, which was not only a literary and artistic revival, but a great moral awakening of nations emerging from childhood to man's estate, was the cause of the treatment with which Luther, in the beginning, was met. A barbarous German friar was not worth notice. Whether there were any legitimate cause for his protest was a matter which was not allowed to trouble the graceful leisure of Rome. It was only when he began to be troublesome that the Pope decided he was to be crushed and swept away. Leo would not take the trouble to see in the threatenings from Germany that there was a great vital principle at work. As the Catholic Görres says:[1] "It was in truth a great and noble movement in the German people that brought about the Reformation. The Latin races may condemn it altogether, but we cannot; for it sprang from the inmost spirit of our race, and extended nearly to the same limits. It was the spirit of a lofty moral disgust at every outrage on what is holy wherever it may appear; of that indignation which is raised by every abuse; of that indestructible love of freedom which is sure to cast off every yoke that perfidious violence would impose;—in a word, the whole mass of salutary qualities which God bestowed on this nation, in order, when need should be, to ward off the corruption to which the warm South so easily inclines."

This contempt for legitimate protest against abuse, the determination to crush the appeal for reformation, had their natural effect. Luther was driven into heresy, and the Church saw devastation spread rapidly, as province after province, kingdom after kingdom, fell away. The unity of the West was once more broken up; this time not by schism but by heresy. Well might one of the later Popes say, his predecessors had done everything to destroy the Church.[2]

[1] *Der Katholik*, xv. 279.

[2] Paul IV., *Calendar of State Papers* (Venetian), vi. No. 425.

When Rome did at last awake it was with a rude awakening. Like half-dazed men, the Popes did not at first seem to realise the gravity of the situation. But the work of reformation was set about in earnest by the Church at Trent; not, however, without misgivings and uneasiness at Rome, where the late experiences of Councils were not forgotten. But sternly facing the facts, without fear or favour, the fathers at Trent, in spite of opposition from the *Curia*, insisted upon taking the question of Reform hand in hand with those of Faith. Every effort was made, not only to save what was not yet lost, but to regain, if possible, what had been allowed to slip away.

It is at this point, when Luther was at last in open revolt, that a meanly clad man with nine companions knelt at the feet of Pope Paul III. and offered his services for the benefit of the Church in her hour of need. Truly, as far as the eye could see, it was a fallen hope. A crippled, broken-down Spanish soldier proposed to retrieve the misfortunes of the Church!

It is not necessary to go over the well-known story of Ignatius of Loyola and the first foundation of the Jesuits. Suffice it to say, he had a singularly clear eye for the needs of the time. Authority had been contested and at length denied; it must therefore be vindicated and set on such a basis as would leave no room for cavil. The Feudal System was gone, and Absolutism was to be set up in its place. When this could be accomplished, the danger as he saw it would be ended. Towards this end he bent all his energies. The Society he founded to bring about the Absolutism of Authority was to have obedience for its vital principle. Himself a soldier, he viewed everything from a military point of view. Obedience became the one thing necessary, and any infraction of this close and particular discipline was to be impossible in his Society. No room was left for self-will. A General, who alone was the Living Rule, directed all things, and his soldiers, mere functionaries, had only to do and die. This principle of blind obedience lead in the course of time to a peculiar characteristic of the Jesuits, which made them akin (strange though it may seem) to that Puritan strain,

so often to be found in those doing, or desirous of doing, great things. There was a sense of Election; and together with this an exclusion of any possibility of doubt as to the advisability of their ends and means.[1] The man became lost in a Society which directed and employed him for her own ends, and which ever appeared to his eyes as great, powerful, and glorious. This repression of self in the Jesuit brought about its own revenge. Lamennais thus describes it: "There was no personal pride, no ambition, no riches in each one of the members considered separately, but there was a collective lust, an ambition, and an immense pride."[2] Joined to all this, there was also, in regard to the old methods, a certain distrust which led to the same practical result as the principle did in the case of the Puritans. In these it took the direction of Presbyterianism; and in the Jesuits, a distinct impatience of episcopal control. We shall find, in the course of their history, many examples of the development of this characteristic. So marked did it become that in recent days so acute an observer as the late Cardinal Manning did not hesitate to say that the Pope was the only plank between the Jesuits and Presbyterianism.

We must also take into consideration the fact that Ignatius was a Spaniard. Already had Clement VII. come to terms with Spain, in the treaty of Barcelona, 1529. The power of France was at an end, and Rome gave herself over to the influences of Spain. One result of this political bondage was that the system of Spain was enforced upon the Church. Spain could not endure discussion or publicity; centralisation was the ideal; routine the practice, and the rights of the people were ignored.[3] All these characteristics found their counterpart in the system adopted by the *Curia*, which was now practically directed by the Spanish ambassa-

[1] When engaged in disputation with some very dogmatic Puritan divines, Cromwell exclaimed: "I beseech you in the bowels of our Lord Jesus Christ, conceive it possible you may be mistaken!"

[2] *Les affaires de Rome*, p. 18.

[3] The Spanish domination in Italy was unfortunate even to the material prosperity of the land. The "wilful depression of industry was partly the result of Spanish aristocratic habits which now invaded Italian society. But it was also deliberately chosen as a means of extinguishing freedom" (J. A. Symonds, p. 53).

dors at Rome. True, indeed, that some Popes were found to chafe under the chains of Spain. But they were soon brought to subjection. It was not until the days of Henri IV. that the Spanish monopoly was effectually broken down. This, then, being the prevalent atmosphere at Rome, Ignatius, as a Spaniard, would naturally fall into line, and form his Society in large measure upon the national characteristics.[1] This Spanish tendency will go far to explain many events in the subsequent history of the Jesuits; and also the tone of mind induced by such a system will be found to be at the bottom of the disputes which arose even in Spain, when the policy of upholding Spanish supremacy was found not to be convenient to the progress and power of the Society.

The Society being founded, and not without opposition from clear-headed men who saw the danger of setting up an *Imperium in Imperio*,—an opposition subsequently justified,—the Jesuits, to overcome the difficulty, promised to be, through their head, at the absolute disposal of the Pope. His authority was to be everything to them. At his word they would undertake any mission[2] to the farthermost part of the world, risking life itself in carrying out his command. But it must be remembered the works their founder originally had in view were those of the Christian ministry, catechising children, and teaching elementary schools. As the Society increased and waxed strong, this latter did not satisfy the ardour of the new men. They began to take the lead in teaching the higher branches of learning. They undertook the education of the Clergy, and the seminary system was introduced to train up priests on the Jesuit models. In these seminaries and theological schools they became the foremost defenders of the papal prerogatives, both temporal and spiritual. Rejecting the wide-minded policy of Nicholas

[1] It may here be pointed out that M. Herrmann Müller in his study on the Origins of the Society of Jesus, lays great stress upon the theory that St. Ignatius derived the essential features of his Society from certain Mohammedan secret Societies then flourishing in Spain. The episode of the "Saracen Knight" and the stay at Manresa are well-known incidents in the life of the great founder.

[2] This word, and the sense it seems to have been accepted in, perhaps implies political missions rather than apostolic labours.

v., and following up the Spanish ideal, they were not adverse to the centralisation of all Church government into the hands of the Roman *Curia*. True Latins, they could not understand the principle of Personality. All were to move as so many parts of a machine. Centralisation became the rallying cry, and the usual effect followed. One part of a highly organised body cannot be over-stimulated without superinducing a corresponding weakness in other parts.

What was aimed at by these men, so earnest and devoted to their own Society, was practically this. The Church, as though a new Pentecost had taken place, was to be reformed upon the model of their Society. In pursuance of this policy, at the Council of Trent, Lainez, one of the first companions of St. Ignatius and his successor as General, tried to induce the bishops, there assembled, to define that they whom "the Holy Ghost had set to rule the Church of God"[1] were only vicars of the Pope. The absolute monarchy of the Jesuit General was to find its counterpart in the Sovereign Pontiff, and bishops were to be reduced to the position of provincials and superiors. Such were the ideas which began to develop in the Society. Under its saintly founder it had desired to be the humble and ready servant, and therefore its members were forbidden to aspire after or accept ecclesiastical dignities.[2] From that lowly aim it developed under successive generals into a power which sought to direct the Church, to tune the pulpits and professorial chairs, to influence men's minds in the confessional, and, going outside the purely religious sphere, to enter into the stormy regions of secular politics, and to renew the face of the earth after their own ideas. This disposition had already been noticed, not only by Popes, but by one of their own generals, St. Francis Borgia. He wrote to his subjects: "You have put aside the pride that aspires to ecclesiastical dignities, and you have done well; but you are ambitious to write great works, and thus gratify it by other means. As lambs we have

[1] Acts xx. 28.

[2] The Society has always set itself against any of the Jesuits being raised to the episcopate. As a bishop, a Jesuit ceases to be under the General, and responsibility becomes then individual.

entered, but as wolves do we rule. We shall be cast out as dogs, but as eagles shall we be renewed."[1]

They set themselves up as bulwarks against Protestantism in every form. Their organisation was a perfect weapon. For instance, when a Jesuit was sent on any mission his superiors knew how to supplement the defects in his character by associating with him a man of the opposite character. Binding thus various minds together in the bond of an obedience which seems the negation of both judgment and will,[2] the Society was able to present an almost irresistible front to the opposing forces of Protestantism, and do much to change a rout into a victory. Their success was wonderful. Full of enthusiasm and zeal, devoted blindly to their Society, the Jesuits were able to bring in numbers of rich and influential persons to their ranks. With a clear understanding of the power of wealth, they became, of set purpose, the apostles of the rich and influential. Their colleges were thronged by pupils who were attracted not only by the free instruction that was offered, but by professors whose learning was certainly brilliant, if not solid. Here a system was in process of time devised which substituted Infusion for Education, so that the pupil received the same moulding as his master. Individuality and initiative were not encouraged. Their pulpits rang with a studied and artificial eloquence; their churches, sumptuous and attractive, were crowded; and in the confessional their advice was eagerly sought in all kinds of difficulties. In time, Direction was reduced to a fine art, of which they were the leading professors. The Jesuits felt they were the new men, the men of the times. With a perfect confidence in themselves, they went forth to set the Church to rights. Their motto, "*To the greater glory of God*," led them on. Not content with St. Paul's advice "to do all for the glory of God," they would fain go beyond all others. This was their characteristic.

But this position had not been achieved without somewhat of domestic struggle and outer scandal. There were many Jesuits who clung to the primitive idea of their founder, and were amazed and fearful at the new departures which were

[1] Quoted in Alzog, iii. 385.

[2] In matters not clearly sinful.

starting up all along the line. In the realms of thought, the ebullition of spirits produced by their well-worked-for success tempted some of their members to put forward views on moral questions which, bringing discredit upon the Church, had to be condemned. There was a tampering with the supremacy of conscience; and this seems to have arisen from the dread of allowing anyone to wander from the fold. To keep them under obedience and within, at any cost, seems to have been the desire. Hence laxity was allowed by some to find entrance into the interpretation of the moral code. The Latin idea of policy comes out in this endeavour to keep in leading-strings those who are "men in a world of men."

The Jesuits of Spain, even in the days of the founder, had always been restless. They chafed under the rule of a General elected for life, and under a form of government which one of the Popes called a tyranny. Lainez succeeded in out-manœuvring their projects for reform. Popes themselves tried in vain to readjust the constitutions of the Society. But all such attempts met with a steady opposition; and the spirit of the reply with which Ricci, the General at the suppression, is credited, was already fixed hard and fast in the hearts of their rulers: *Jesuitæ aut sint ut sunt aut plane non sint.*

No Englishmen seem to have joined the Society in the first years. But St. Ignatius in his zeal was profoundly touched by the religious calamities of this country. A correspondence passed between him and Cardinal Pole on the subject, in which he expressed his ardent desire to help on the work of reunion. Burnet, not altogether a reliable authority, says, on the strength of a Venetian manuscript, that the Jesuits suggested to Pole "that whereas the Queen (Mary) was restoring the goods of the Church that were in her hands, there was but little purpose to raise up the old foundations, for the Benedictine order was become rather a clog than a help to the Church; they therefore desired that those houses should be assigned to them for maintaining schools and seminaries which they should set on quickly."[1] Their after policy makes this statement not altogether unlikely.

It was not till the change in religion made by Elizabeth

[1] *History of the Reformation* (ed. Oxford), vol. ii. p. 524.

that Englishmen were forced to find abroad opportunities for practising the religion of their forefathers. We find traces of several Englishmen in the records of the Society in the early years of Elizabeth's reign, the most notable being that of Fr. Jasper Heywood, son of the epigrammatist of that name. But it was not till Pius V. promulgated that most disastrous Bull, *Regnans in excelsis* [1570], which made civil allegiance an impossibility to the timorous English Catholic, that the distinct movement towards the Society began. There are two names among the early English Jesuits which stand out above all others: Campion the hero and Parsons the politician. Strangely enough these two have remained types of the future English Jesuits: Campion was the example of the missionary who attended solely to his spiritual duties; and Parsons of the ever restless plotter and director of affairs. As Parsons for sheer ability is the greatest man the English Jesuits have ever produced, his personality and history must needs be treated of at length; for the spirit he impressed upon the English Jesuits was lasting, and can be traced throughout their history. Campion and his followers, on the other hand, while being the true heroes who did not hesitate to seal their convictions with their blood, do not present so interesting a picture to the general reader as do the others. They are to be admired in the sanctuary of the Conscience, and the tribute of honest reverence is their due. But Parsons, Garnett, and Petre are names of men who had to do with the making of English history; and it is necessary that their lives should be set forth in a clear and steady light.

CHAPTER II

ROBERT PARSONS

AMONG the religious houses suppressed by Henry VIII. was that of the Black Canons, or Augustinians, at Taunton. William Williams, the prior, together with his twelve religious, surrendered their house to the king on 12th February. Among the names of those who received pensions is that of John Heywood, who had a yearly grant of £5, 6s. 8d.[1] A few years after he was appointed to the living of Nether Stowey, a small village in Somerset, seven and a half miles to the north-west of Bridgewater. Among his parishioners were Henry and Christiana Parsons,[2] who were, according to their son Robert's autobiographical notes, in humble circumstances. They were probably of the yeoman class. From a letter written by their son John, rector of Chardlink [31st May 1602], to Dr. Sutcliffe, dean of Exeter, and Thomas Somaston, archdeacon of Totnes, in answer to the scurrillous attack of the former upon the honesty and morality of Father Parsons'

[1] According to Boase's *Register of Oxford*, John Heywood was a member of Balliol College. Another name in the community was that of William Persons, who was very likely a relation of Robert Parsons.

[2] The name appears under various forms as Parsons, Parsonnes, Parson, and Persons. I have adopted throughout the form by which Robert is generally mentioned in the English State Papers. He seems to have used the form Persons at least after he became a Jesuit, perhaps to do away with the grounds for a scurrilous attack on his parentage. Of another name, *Cowbuck*, which his enemies say was his proper name, it will be enough to quote the *Briefe Apologie*, in which, writing anonymously [1601] of himself, he says: "If any of Fr. Parsons' ancestors were called also upon some particular cause by that name, what importeth that, or why is it brought in here but only out of malice? For we see it is an ordinary thing in England in divers men to be called by divers surnames, to wit So *alias* So; and whereas there are many brothers, nephews, cousins-german, and other kindred of Fr. Parsons living in England, no one of them is called by any other name than Parsons, so far as we can inform ourselves" (pp. 182, 183).

parents, we learn that this couple "lived together most comfortably and sociably in holy matrimony in their own house about fifty years; and in their time were the best housekeepers in all that township, all which is to be testified by the general consent of all in this country."[1]

Robert, the great English Jesuit, was the sixth child out of eleven,[2] and was born on 24th June 1546. He was the first child baptized by the new incumbent. The parents were Catholics; for down in the far west the alterations in religion were not at first felt. It was only the constant changes, backwards and forwards, culminating in the developments of Elizabeth's religious policy, that shook the constancy of many. For, as Mr. Simpson says in his *Life of Edmund Campion*, men were "waiting for something to turn up; waiting like the drunken man for the door to come round to them, instead of shaking off their lethargy and walking out through the open door . . . waiting for Fortune to change for them, instead of trying to change their own fortune, and forgetting that Fate unresisted overcomes us, but is conquered by resistance. It was this English dilatoriness, this provisional acquiescence in wrong, this stretching of the Conscience in order that men might keep

[1] Oliver's *Collections*, p. 158.

[2] Of the rest of the family all that I have been able to gather is this: Thomas, who seems to have been the eldest, was a yeoman of the middle class. He married a rich widow and had property at Netherton. Two of his children became Catholics; one a Jesuit, and the other a Benedictine nun at the English convent at Brussels. Of Thomas, Fr. Oldcorne writes to Robert Parsons: [15th June 1603] "For your brother Thomas, he lives in Somersetshire, and I hear in good estate for the world, but he is no Catholic, nor is there any hope." John, after passing through Oxford, where in 1575, before his B.A., he had to purge himself from the suspicion of papistry (Boase ii. 1, p. 153), became a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England, but kept up a correspondence with his more famous brother. Garnett, writing to Parsons [21st April 1599], says: "Her son John hath not his letter yet. There is no hope of him, nor ever was, but I will send it shortly." He died about 1601. Of Richard, Fr. Oldcorne, in the above-mentioned letter, says, "that he and his wife are Catholics, and have been so these six or seven years; they live but poorly in outward show." Richard was in Rome in October 1606. (See the *Pilgrim Book of the English College*, Foley, vol. vi. p. 572.) Of George, we shall speak in the text. One sister appears, of whom Garnett writes [1603]: "The house of Fr. Parsons' sister where she laying, being very honest and of good reputation, was searched on Christmas Night 1602, and *Agnus Deis* and beads and suchlike were found. She was so frightened by the knaves that she died on Innocents Day." She had previously been hunted away from another parish by the minister for her brother's sake.

what they had, which made it possible that England should be lost to the Church, as it has since lost many a man who was quite convinced that he ought to be a Catholic, but waited till his conviction faded away. The Catholics waited for the times to mend; and they waited till their children were brought up to curse the religion of their fathers, till they had been robbed piece-meal of their wealth and power, and found themselves a waning sect in the land they had once occupied from sea to sea."[1] So it turned out eventually with Henry Parsons, who fell away, so it would seem, some time after the birth of Robert. The mother, a woman of remarkably strong character, remained staunch, and one half of the children kept their ancestral faith.

In early childhood, Robert was sent to his eldest brother, who was in trade, but had to return to his parents when that brother failed in business. Showing a quick intelligence and a capacity for learning, the parish priest advised the parents to give Robert a trial at the neighbouring Grammar School of Stoke Courcy, and undertook to pay for his education. He went; and in his fourteenth or fifteenth year was sent to the Free School at Taunton with his younger brother John. This was just at the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. From a letter[2] written by another brother, Richard Parsons, to Fr. Edward Coffin, S.J., some time between 1596 and 1598, we hear some characteristic details of his life at Taunton. "After he had been there some ten or twelve months, his master being very sharp and cruel to his scholars, and as the schoolmaster did repent afterwards, for that he found my brother to have a good wit and could do well, was more sharp to him than to my other brother, or to any other of his scholars, insomuch that my brother was weary of being a scholar, and would fain have left his book; and thereupon wrote a letter to my father both of his master's cruelty and of his unfitness to be a scholar, and of the great desire he had to give over his book, with many other reasons he did allege; he being but a boy of fifteen years old; and with his smooth and fine letter he had written had almost gained my father, but my

[1] *Edmund Campion* (2nd ed.), p. 9.

[2] Printed in *The London and Dublin Weekly Orthodox Journal*, vol. xi. p. 122.

mother, who had a great desire to have him a scholar, would not hear of it; and presently took horse, it being seven miles off, and when she came thither went and told his master all that he had written, and made him whip him well; and afterwards herself did so chide him and threaten him, that if he came home she would tie him to a post and whip him, and yet that should not serve his turn, for she would presently send him back to his master again. And this schoolmaster of his was a Catholic, and afterwards put out of his place for it, and although my brother was then young, yet he did observe his great goodness of life and other things which did him good afterwards. But now when my brother saw there was no remedy, but that he must go to his school and give contentment to his master, and that all hope was taken away of going home, he fell to his book very heartily and became the best in the school, and so continued as long as he was there. And his master that knew his good wit when he was past his school wrote to my father to send him to Oxford, for that he would prove a rare man." Thus early does Robert Parsons give indications of a like character to his father's.

At the age of eighteen Robert was sent to Oxford, first going to St. Mary's Hall. After two years of Logic, he entered Balliol College, "but whether as a servitor or scholar I know not," says Anthony Wood.[1] After some years, at the latter end of May 1568, being then in his twenty-second year, he was admitted Bachelor of Arts, "with as great credit as any one did a great while. And this being known was made Fellow of that house and afterwards Bursar of the house, and his name was so much known about, both in the west country as also in London, that everyone was desirous to have his sons with him; as in the west was my Lord Seymour, Mr Southcotte, Mr. Hill, and many others; in London, Mr. Baker, Mr. Sydney, Mr. Culpepper, and many other Londoners; so that he had in Balliol College and Hall more than thirty scholars under him. . . . After that he had been Bachelor three or four years, according to the customs, as soon as might be, he passed Master of Arts with great honour as

[1] *Athenæ* (ed. Bliss), vol. ii. p. 63.

could be, and continued still his office of Bursar." So, his brother Richard.

Parsons' sojourn at Oxford was the beginning of his stormy life; and here begin also the conflicting statements of friends and enemies. But it will be necessary just to glance for a moment at the religious state of Oxford about that time. In a greater degree than Cambridge, Oxford for a long time held fast to her Catholic traditions.

Bishop Quadra, writing to the Duchess of Parma (15th November 1561), says:

"Two days ago, six young Oxford students were thrown into the Tower of London. They were brought before the Council on a charge of having resisted the Mayor, who had gone to take away the crucifix from their College chapel; and they not only confessed that they had done so, but said they were Catholics, and took the Sacrament as such; and they even offered to dispute publicly or privately with the heretics concerning the Sacrament. The Council was quite scandalised to hear such freedom of talk; but the Mayor assured them the whole place was of the same opinion, and there were not three houses in it that were not filled with Papists; whereat the Council were far from pleased, and told the Mayor not to say such a thing elsewhere."[1]

Great trouble was given to the authorities when they attempted to enforce conformity[2] to the Queen's religion. The Puritan party, who had succeeded in establishing themselves at the sister University, were now engaged in vigorously

[1] *Calendar of Spanish State Papers* (Simancas), vol. i. No. 143. Writing some eighteen months earlier (23rd May 1560) to Feria, he says: "Oxford students and the law students in London have been taken in great numbers. They have also arrested those who came to my house on Easter Day to hear Mass, and have declared my house suspect" (*ibid.* i. No. 106).

[2] Perne, Dean of Ely, and sometime master of Peter House, Cambridge, writing at a later date, refers to the dissatisfied at the Universities: "If we look into our own Universities we shall find Papists there. The diarist that I sometimes transcribe from (*MSS. John ep. Elien*), who seems to have been a diligent noter of matters of mark concerning religion in his time, notes that in Exeter College, Oxon., of eighty were found but four obedient subjects, all the rest secret or open Roman affectionaries; and particularly one Savage of that house, a most earnest defender of the Pope's Bull and Excommunication (of the Queen). These were chiefly such as came out of the western parts where Popery greatly prevailed, and the gentry bred up in that religion" (Strypes' *Annals of the Reformation*, vol. ii. pp. 196, 197).

storming the stronghold of the old faith. They were making efforts to uproot Catholicity throughout the country in reprisal for the treatment inflicted on their brethren in Flanders by Alva, whose cruelties have given his name an everlasting infamy.[1] There was also the interest of self-preservation at work among the leaders of the party; for reports were constantly coming over from France and Germany that Spain intended an invasion for the purpose of reducing England once more to the Pope of Rome. Joined to this, Pius V., urged on by a handful of English exiles[2] upon whose misguided information he relied, had, without the Spanish king's consent,[3] published his Bull of Excommunication against Elizabeth. Not only did he cut her off from the Communion of the Church of which he was the visible head, but, going further, he declared her deposed, and called upon her subjects to desert her cause. The effect of this measure was not only to cause Catholics to rally round their lawful Queen, but gave the Puritans an occasion of pushing their policy forward to the utmost.

It is to be remarked that the Pope did not base his claim to depose the Queen on the over-lordship given him by John Lackland, nor on any other temporal ground. There might, at anyrate, have been something to be said, for such a claim based on the Feudal System. But he took an altogether

[1] Mr. Symonds describes in strong but not unwarrantable language the Spaniards: They "abandoned themselves to a dark fiend of religious fanaticism; . . . they were merciless in their conquests and unintelligent in their administration of subjected provinces . . . they glutted their lusts of avarice and hatred on industrious folk of other creeds within their borders . . . they cultivated barren pride and self-conceit in social life, (*and*) at the great Epoch of Europe's reawakening they chose the wrong side and adhered to it with fatal obstinacy. This obstinacy was disastrous to their neighbours and ruinous to themselves" (*op. cit.* p. 64).

[2] Harding, Stapleton, Morton, and Webbe among others.

[3] "His Holiness has taken this step without communicating with me in any way, which certainly has greatly surprised me, because my knowledge of English affairs is such that I believe I do give a better opinion of them, and the course that ought to have been adopted, than anyone else. Since, however, his Holiness allowed himself to be carried away by his zeal, he no doubt thought that what he did was the only thing requisite for all to turn out as he wished, and if such were the case, I, of all the faithful sons of the Holy See, would rejoice the most. But I fear that not only will this not be the case, but that this sudden and unexpected step will exacerbate feeling there and drive the Queen and her friends to move to oppress and persecute the few good Catholics still remaining in England" (*Philip to De Spes* [30th June 1570], *S. S. P.* (Simancas), No. 193).

different ground, and followed the common teaching of theo logians of the day concerning the papal prerogatives. On of his predecessors, Paul IV., is reported by the Venetia ambassadors, Soranzo and Mocenigo, to have said that "th dignity of the Pontiff consisted in putting kings and emperor under his feet"; and he "wished to be feared by them, sayin that the Pope as Vicar of Christ was lord of all tempora princes."[1] As to Elizabeth's right to the throne, she did nc base it upon legitimate birth, but on the Act of Succession which was confirmed by the will of her people. When Phili II. sent his ambassador Feria to offer his support to her clair to the Crown, she proudly answered "she would owe it onl to her people."[2] Thus the controversy between Pius an Elizabeth resulted in a dead block.

These events had their effects in Oxford as well as else where. The University became a house divided against itsel The Puritan part took the aggressive. Adam Squire, th Master of Balliol, was a Puritan, and so were most of th Fellows. It was a difficult position then for any young ma at Oxford to follow his conscience; and what is said c Campion is true also of Parsons. "His youth, ambition desire to satisfy the expectations of his friends, and emulatio at the advance of his equals and inferiors pulled him back while remorse of conscience, fear of hell, and an invincibl persuasion of the truth of the Catholic doctrine and the falsc hood of the Protestant opinion, pushed him onward. H hearkened to both sides, inwardly to see whether he coul find sufficient reason to allow his conscience to follow in peac the course to which his worldly interests so strongly incline him."[3]

Twice already had Parsons taken oath of the Queen supremacy in matters of religion; but, as he tells us in Stonyhurst manuscript, it was through Campion's influenc then at its height, that he escaped taking it for the third tim "I knew him at Oxford, and it was through him that the oat was not tendered to me when I took my M.A. degree."[4]

[1] Albèri, *Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti Al Senato*, vol. iv. p. 48.
[2] Hume's *Philip II. of Spain*, p. 61.
[3] *Campion*, p. 21.
[4] *Ibia.* p. 6.

If Campion were the good influence on the side of Conscience, the study of the Fathers to which Parsons now gave himself was a powerful auxiliary. "Whatever we had heard or conceived in the whole day for pulling out this thorn of Conscience and for smoothing the way to be Protestant, either by good fellowship and conversation with Protestants themselves or by hearing their sermons or reading their books, all this was dashed by one hour's reading of some work by the old holy doctors, and the wound of Conscience was made green again and as grievous as ever by every page, which spake of virtue and austerity, or of questions of controversy which were settled there as clearly as if the Fathers had distinctly foreseen the tumults of these days."[1]

But Parsons in his *Autobiographical Notes*, written late in life, has left out one effect of these mental struggles, and it is the one we offer as the key to his after-life. For a time he gave himself up to Puritanism. It was a natural resource for a character like his. Why struggle with Fate? Once convinced of Election, then a sense of personal infallibility comes in to strengthen the wavering will and harden it against all difficulties. The contentment brought for awhile by Puritanism sorted well, in one form or another, with his ease. He became an apostle of the New Light, and tried to propagate the tenets of Calvin. As bursar, he sold a number of Catholic theological works from the College Library, and replaced them with the best books on the new doctrines. He openly held their views. Christopher Bagshawe, who was in the College with Parsons, and who, later on, was a great opponent, thus refers to the matter; and as his testimony is borne out by that of others, it may be accepted: "For religion Mr. Parsons then did profess himself a Protestant, and that with such affectation as he dealt with Mr. Squire for direction in the study of divinity, and conferred ordinarily in the reading of Calvin with Mr. Hyde, a Fellow in the house, a known Calvinist, but otherwise learned and a very moral gentleman. Yea, being bursar, he had disfurnished the College Library of many ancient books and rare manuscripts . . . and in their stead brought in a number of heretical books the first that

[1] *Campion* p. 22.

ever were there, which yet remain for an argument of his wan of religion, and for a corrasive to his conscience whilst h liveth."[1]

With a mind in such a state, one day leaning to th opinion that he was of the Elect, and the next day turnin towards the Old Faith, it was no wonder that his relation with the rest of the College were not happy His very succes as a tutor would, under the circumstances, be no recommenda tion to the good graces of some of his Fellows. He seems t have quarrelled with most of them, and also fell out with th Master, who became his bitter enemy. His brother Richar thus narrates the circumstance: "And there was great ad continually between the Master of the house, called Ada Squire, and him; partly for that my brother had told hi sometimes of his evil life which none knew so particularly my brother; but Squire could not abide to hear of it." There were also some pecuniary transactions of the Maste little to his credit, in the discovery of which Parsons, bursar, had necessarily a hand. There was no love lo between them; and Squire waited his chance to do Pars a bad turn. It was not long in coming. Parsons made accusation, without grounds as it appears, against Bagshaw of alluring, during the Christmas vacation, "unto him a ve proper youth, called Mr. James Hanley, of whom Fath Parsons being tutor had special care both for his good pa and for his friends, who lived in London, and with who Father Parsons remained at this time."[3] On his retu Parsons complained of the matter. At once there was general outcry made against him; and threats were free used that his opponents would drive him, then and the with all his belongings out of the College.

Already, owing perhaps to his religious perplexiti Parsons had talked of giving up his Fellowship and goi away from Oxford; and during a recent visit to Somers shire he had received promises of help to enable him to stu law in London. Advantage was taken of this by some of Fellows of his College to induce him to resign instead of be

[1] Bagshawe's reply to *An Apologie*, in Dr. Ely's *Certaine Briefe Notes*, p. 33.
[2] *Loc. cit.*
[3] *A Briefe Apologie*, p. 196.

expelled. To this he agreed; and to make his leaving easier he was allowed to keep his chambers and scholars until Easter. This clearly proves that his resignation was not caused by any criminal reasons, such as his enemies afterwards asserted. His resignation runs as follows:—

"Ego Robertus Persons, socius collegii de Balliolo, resigno omne meum jus, titulum et clameum, quem habeo vel habere potero societatis meæ in dicto collegio, quod quidem facio sponte ~~et~~ non coactus, die decimo tertio mensis Februarii, Anno Dom. 1573.

"Per me Rob. Persons."

The erasure is strange, and Archbishop Abbot writing in 1601 says: "In the resignation, as you may see, he had written *sponte et coactus*; but now it is *sponte non coactus*, (*et*) being blotted out and (*non*) being set over, which I am deceived if it be not altered by somebody else of late, inasmuch as I am verily persuaded that since my coming to the College, I have seen it *sponte et coactus*, which, although it carry a contradiction, yet intimateth that he resigned against his will."[1] The reasons Abbot gives for the resignation are mere hearsay, and are out of keeping with Parsons' known character. We may pass them by without notice. The decree allowing him to retain his rooms and the perquisites of his Fellowship till the following Easter, which of itself is sufficient answer to any charges of immorality, runs thus:—

"Eodem tempore decretum est unanimi consensu mri et reliquorum sociorum ut magister Robertus Parsons nuperrime socius retineat sibi sua cubicula et scholares quosque voluerit et communia sua de collegio habeat usque ad festum Paschatis immediate sequentis."

But this decree was presently cancelled or crossed out; and so remains on the Register Book.[2] The reason is this.

[1] See the letter in *Athenæ, loc. cit.*

[2] Mr. Bliss, in his edition of the *Athenæ*, says that these extracts have been collated with the originals and prove "to be minutely correct, except that at present the word *non* does not appear, although it is clear that there has been some erasure immediately above the word *et*" (*loc. cit.*).

Parsons, being now free, seems to have turned his mind towards the Old Religion, and given up Puritanism as an alternative to the Catholic faith. Fired with new zeal, he protested against the eating of flesh meat by some in hall during that Lent, and tried to get "some of this crew"[1] punished. Appealing to Leicester the Chancellor, and failing to get his support, Parsons had to leave the College at once. And those of his enemies (not Bagshawe) who were resolute to get rid of him "provided the tolling of a bell for him as the manner is for one which is to depart from the world."[2]

In his account Parsons says that it was because he was a Catholic at heart, and that the bell rang as for fire "that a great Papist was fired out of Balliol College that day."

Such are the main facts of a story which has been much discussed; and the truth seems to be that he was forced to resign on account of perpetual disagreements with his fellows, and was afterwards expelled the College when it was found out that he had become in heart "a great Papist."

Leaving Oxford, Parsons, accompanied by his brother Richard, went up to London, where he frequented the Inner Temple, and there—it is said—asseverated to one James Clarke, secretary to Popham, that he was not, nor never intended to be, a Catholic. It was probably during one of those hours of perplexity which befall every man meditating a step of importance, that this took place. A great deal has been made about this, and to the disadvantage of Parsons' sincerity; and we think unfairly. Having lost one sheet-anchor, and for the moment without another, he was quite at sea, tossing about upon every billow of doubt and blown by every wind of doctrine.

Here in London, he fell in, says his brother, "with my Lord of Buckhurst, who was afterwards Treasurer, who loved him exceedingly well, and kept him some two or three months with him, and would never willingly have him out of his sight." Other friends, too, gathered round him. In his *Autobiographical Notes* he says: "God had provided that Sir Richard Baker (whose son Thomas had been my scholar) should offer me unasked a lease of certain lands fallen of late to his elder

[1] *A Briefe Apologie*, p. 197.

[2] Bagshawe, *loc. cit.*

son, in Somersetshire, which I took, and going down into the country I sold for a hundred pounds and more to James Clarke, Popham's secretary,[1] and with this and other help of friends I was able to go on to travel. After Easter I returned to London, and putting myself under the protection of Lord Buckhurst by means of the Culpeppers and Sydneys (of whom I had two or three for my scholars at Oxford), I departed from England in May or June 1574, leaving all that ever I had in England in confidence unto the said Lord, who dealt honourably with me afterwards when in Italy I entered religion; for he delivered all left to his custody with the persons I assigned." Lord Buckhurst persuaded Parsons to go to Padua to study physic. Seemingly still undecided about religion, he fell in with his patron's suggestion, and set out with an Oxford friend, one John Lane of Corpus Christi, and another. Parsons was now nearly twenty-eight when the great step in his life was to be made; but when, where, and how, he knew not.

[1] A Declaration of James Clarke of the Middle Temple gives some additional information. Clarke had been a schoolfellow of Parsons at Taunton. He says: "After expulsion from Oxford, Parsons was very often with me in the Middle Temple for the space of seven or eight weeks." Parsons wanting to be introduced to some of Clarke's friends, he was asked bluntly, "Are you a Papist?" "It was," as he said, "a slander bruited forth against him by some enemies, among which he named one Dr. Squire, as I now remember; and protested to me that he neither then was, nor never meant to be, any Papist; and that he would so satisfy me upon any conference but also upon his oath." See T. G. Law's *Archpriest Controversy*, ii. p. 242.

CHAPTER III

PARSONS JOINS THE SOCIETY

In the early summer of 1574, the Netherlands were comparatively quiet. The cruelties of Alva had entirely failed to break the spirit of the inhabitants, and seven years of bloodshed and cruelty had only resulted in stubborn resistance. Alva having been recalled to Spain in disgrace, a new governor, Don Luis di Requesens, inaugurated a policy of pacification. The country being therefore quieter and safer for strangers, Robert Parsons set his face towards the Netherlands. Embarking for Calais, he quietly made his way to Antwerp, whence he intended to visit Frankfort on occasion of the great Fair; but some of his travelling companions not arriving, he went for a few days to Louvain, "in the company of two godly men, one Mr. Thomas Yates (afterwards of the Society, and now in Brazil), and the other, John Slade (afterwards priest)."[1] These men so impressed Parsons with their virtuous example and godly conversation that he resolved to find out a fellow-countryman, a Jesuit, William Good[2] by name, then living at Louvain, and to enter with him into the whole question of religion. Arrived at Louvain, the Jesuit welcomed the young man, and heard his story. Impressed by his distinguished appearance and his high intellectual gifts, the Jesuit saw that Parsons, if properly directed, would turn out a useful member of the Society. He judged well. But the first thing was to settle the young man's religious difficulties and reconcile him to the Church. It was, of course, but natural that Fr. Good

[1] *Autobiographical Notes.*

[2] Good, a Somersetshire man, had been one of the altar-boys at Glastonbury before the dissolution of that house. He was, we think, the first Englishman to become a Jesuit.



S. IGNATIVS LOYOLA SOCIETATIS IESV FVNDATOR

ST. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA

FIRST GENERAL OF THE SOCIETY. 1541-1556

From an engraving by M. Vanden Enden

should try and attract so promising a young man to the Society. It was the ordinary custom. Campion, later on, writing to Parsons about another individual whom they hoped to make a Jesuit, says: "Do let us conspire to deliver that good soul; it is good fishing."[1] Parsons, following the advice of Fr. Good, remained in Louvain some ten days to make the "Spiritual Exercises."

These "Exercises," formulated by St. Ignatius from the *Spiritual Exercises of Abbat Cisneros of Monserrat*, and based on the same idea[2] (St. Ignatius had gone through them while in retreat at that Benedictine house), have always been popular and considered useful in determining a vocation. Starting from the point, "Why did God make me?" they proceed by carefully planned steps which are calculated to inspire terror or joy, remorse or hope, or to stir up sentiments of generosity and love. These "Exercises" are spread over a time varying from eight days to a month, and all lead up to the question—"How am I fulfilling the end of my creation?" Retired altogether from the outer world, under the sole care of a skilful director, the exercitant is, for the time, entirely engrossed upon the state of his soul and the consideration of motives that may cause him to act in the desired way. It is calculated that at the end of the time one is able, with calm deliberation and unbiassed mind, to take an important step

[1] *Ut infra*, p. 32.

[2] The Benedictines were the instructors of St. Ignatius in the spiritual life. He found at Monserrat a work used by the monks, and of which in 1500 an edition had been printed in the vernacular for the use of pilgrims. According to Yepez (1621) in his *Chronica generalia ordinis Sti. Benedicti*, it is "the tradition of all the religious of Monserrat that Father John Chanones communicated to Ignatius, his son in Jesus Christ, the *Exercises of Father Garcia de Cisneros*, as practised at Monserrat, and that Ignatius took them with him to Manresa . . . and being filled with fervour, he communicated them to others until the time when, having become a man perfect and well versed in knowledge, he retouched, altered, and added some things to the book of Father Cisneros to form his own Exercises conformable to his Institute" (vol. iv. pp. 357–9). In the adaptation an important difference was introduced. The work of Cisneros is designed to provoke individual effort, and leaves liberty to each soul, which is alone with God; but that of Ignatius is based on a different principle altogether. The application and method of the Jesuit "Exercises" is original. The spirit is military, not monastic. There is something between the soul and God: and that something is the Director. The "Exercises," according to the method of St. Ignatius, are not to be taken; they are to be given. The part of the exercitant, to use the term, is to receive them.

after considering it "in the light of God." To a well-balanced mind a period of prayerful retirement may be refreshing and invigorating; and to a weak mind battling with sin or lingering over forbidden pleasure, these "Exercises," under a skilful director, may bring about a bracing of the will to resist the evil and to turn to God's service. They may also have other results.

What happened in Parsons' case was the settling of his religious convictions and a strong tendency towards the Society, which he began to see would supply, through the spirit of obedience, that strong craving for irresponsibility which had led him to take up Puritanism. Relinquishing the idea of visiting Frankfort, he set out for Italy with his two friends; and after a short stay at Rome arrived with them at Padua, where, he tells us, "we took a very commodious house of our own, they two (John Lane and Luke Atslow) studying law, and I, physic; and finding ourselves very well settled, I bought good store of books for my faculty and also provision of apparel." It is evident that he intended to settle down at Padua for a regular course of study, and had no immediate idea of doing anything else. But after the excitement of travel, and the novelty of foreign life was passed, he became aware of the same want of support which, at Oxford, as at Taunton, drove him to find it in submission either to an authority or to a system. He lost all peace of mind. The seed implanted in his soul by Fr. Good at Louvain was beginning to swell and shoot forth. The Society was calling him. It promised to give him the support he needed. The Jesuit's life of obedience would be a blessed relief from the sense of personal responsibility. What were freedom, wealth, family ties in comparison with that repose said to come to him who gives up judgment and will, and follows simply and blindly the judgment and will of a superior? The struggle in Parsons' soul was severe. Now came in with renewed force his considerations at Louvain. They turned the scale. Secretly, and without bidding farewell to his friends, he left Padua for Rome. "It was at the end of the month of May 1575 when I left Padua, and though I was no good goer on foot, and the weather very hot, yet by God's help I made all

that journey without any riding."[1] Arrived in the Eternal City, which was then keeping the Holy Year, he lingered on some weeks, visiting shrines and churches, before he finally resolved to offer himself to the Society. At last the struggle was over. Everard Mercurianus, the fourth General (appointed in 1573), received him into the Society, upon St. James' Day, 25th July 1575, Gregory XIII. (Hugo Buonocompagno) being Pope. Before entering the novitiate of St. Andrew's on the Quirinal, under Fr. Fabius de Fabiis, he settled his worldly affairs, "especially of such goods as I left at Padua and in the Lord Buckhurst his hands in England, I (then) found myself exceedingly comforted . . . My two companions at Padua, Mr. Lucas Atslow and John Lane, hearing of my resolution, they made the like, but Mr. Atslow died soon after in Padua, and Mr. John Lane came and entered the Society in Rome." Parsons' Oxford friend, Campion, who was some seven years his senior, had preceded him into the Society, and, at Brunn in Moravia, was nearing the end of his two years' novitiate.

During the long period of probation Parsons had to undergo the six *experimenta* laid down in the Rule for testing the novice's spirit. For a whole month he had to be in retreat, following, at full length and detail, the "Spiritual Exercises." For another month, as a beggar (for the Jesuits are mendicant clerks), he was sent out to solicit alms from door to door for his house; during a like period he was sent to the hospitals to serve the sick poor in all sorts of humiliating offices. Another month was spent in the primary aims of the Society, namely, teaching the catechism to poor children and instructing the ignorant. He had also to take his turn in all the menial employments of the house. These active works did not all come in succession, but were distributed over the whole period of the novitiate. The principal aim of this two years' "probation" was to test the novice and make him apt for the ends the Society has in view. A perfect manifestation of Conscience to the Superior outside the Sacrament of Penance is ordered in the Rule,[2] which says: "And let them be admonished to hide no temptation, but to disclose it either to him, to their confessor, or to their Superior; nay, more, to take a pleasure

[1] *Autobiographical Notes.* [2] Pars iii. cap. i. s. 12.

in thoroughly manifestating their whole soul to them, not only disclosing their defects, but even their penances or mortifications, their devotions and all their virtues, desiring with perfect will to be guided by them, if perchance they have deviated from the direct path; and not wishing to be led by their own judgments except it agrees with that of those who are to them instead of Christ our Lord." The abnegation of the intellect and will, by obedience to the Superior, is made an essential to advancement in perfection. The twenty-third paragraph of the same chapter of the Rule says: "It is specially conducive to advancement, nay even necessary, that all yield themselves to perfect obedience, regarding the Superior (be he who he may) as Christ the Lord; and submitting to him with inward reverence and love . . . but let these also strive to acquire perfect resignation and denial of their own will and judgment, in all things conforming their will and judgment to that which the Superior wills and judges (where sin is not perceived); the will and judgment of the Superior being set before them as the rule of their will and judgment, whereby they may more exactly be conformed to that chief and supreme rule of all goodwill and judgment, which is the eternal Goodness and Wisdom." Again and again in the Rule and Constitutions this spirit of blind obedience is insisted upon. St. Ignatius in a well-known letter tells the Portuguese Jesuits, who were in a state of rebellion, that a Jesuit has to be in the hands of his superiors as a stick in the hands of a man, or as a corpse which has no will of its own. In one of the Declarations of the General Congregation attached to the Constitutions, and having the same authority,[1] we read: "Obedience as to *execution* is yielded when the thing bidden is done; as to the *will*, when he who obeys wishes the same thing as he who commands; as to the *intellect*, when he thinks as does his Superior, and esteems as well ordered that which is ordered. And that obedience is imperfect in which beyond external (execution) there is not this consent of the will and judgment between him who commands and him who obeys."[2]

[1] These Declarations were produced by Lainez at the General Congregation held two years after St. Ignatius' death.

[2] *Institutum Societatis Iesus, etc.*, Prague (1757), p. 408.

In all this can be seen the military instincts of the founder of the Society. The result has been to make the Society a human institution, which knows how to adapt its means to the end in view. A Jesuit Superior has to know his subjects thoroughly, even their most secret thoughts; just as he, by a system of mutual denunciations, is known to his superiors. All this knowledge, and the power it implies, is locked up in the hands of one man, the General over the whole Society, who is appointed for life. It has been necessary to dwell thus upon the principle of Jesuit training, to understand its effect on the character of one like Robert Parsons.

While we leave him in the novitiate on the Quirinal, finding all and more than he sought—and curiously enough even here a certain principle of predestination at work [1]—we must first glance at the state of the Society at this present period. During the generalate of Everard Mercurianus, the numbers of the Jesuits had risen, within forty years, to five thousand, their houses to one hundred and ten. The whole Society was divided into twenty-one distinct provinces. So marvellous a success went far to uphold the opinion, both from within and without the Order, that the Society was the one hope of a shattered and shaken Church. And it was with this supreme conviction that Robert Parsons, some time after 25th July 1577, bound himself by vow to the Society. But the Society did not yet bind itself to him. Admission, as it were, into the inner circle was granted then but rarely, and after a very long probation; for from these picked men were chosen the chiefs who directed all over the world the destinies of the Society. Robert Parsons had to wait awhile and be tried.

During his novitiate, several Oxford friends joined the Society in Rome: William Weston,[2] John Lane of Corpus Christi, Henry Garnett and Giles Wallop of New College, and Thomas Stephens. This joyful news was not kept from Campion in Bohemia. Parsons writes: "Of all these—our

[1] I am referring to a statement attributed to the General, St. Francis Borgia (1565–72), to the effect that Christ had appeared to him, and promised for the first three hundred years that no Jesuit, who persevered in the Society, should be eternally lost.

[2] Mr. Simpson says Weston was of All Souls. There is no such name at that time on the Register. The tradition is that he was an Oxford man; but when and how attached seem impossible to discover.

being in Rome and entering together the Society, when I had written to good Fr. Campion, he wrote to me again of his wonderful joy and hope that God would one day use mercy towards our country and restore the Catholic faith again, as also vouchsafe to serve Himself of some of our labours to that happy end, seeing He had so wonderfully drawn so many together in one purpose and place for His holy service. And withal again insinuated his own desire to be employed that way when God pleased."[1] A close correspondence seems to have existed between Parsons and Campion; and the following letter is characteristic:—

"Edmund Campion to Robert Parsons at Rome, greeting. —I have received your letter, my brother, teeming not only with discretion and weight, but also, what is the chief thing, with love and piety. I readily take your advice, and consent to do my duty, in which I confess I have been for some time rather lax, somewhat more lengthily and liberally than you; but I had written in that time to Martin (Gregory), and my letter, I suppose, is still in Flanders, where it must have arrived after his departure. Do let us conspire to deliver that good soul; it is good fishing. I love him on many accounts I can say nothing *ἐμφατικώτερον*, I love him; I congratulate him with all my heart upon making the acquaintance of so many of you; my part shall not be wanting. At the end of his last letter to me there was something that showed that this miserable and slippery world was not altogether to his taste 'I am in peril in the world; let your prayers preserve me. Let us pray God; if he is needed he will be granted to us. About myself, I would only have you to know that from the day I arrived here I have been extremely well—in a perpetual bloom of health, and that I was never at any age less upset by literary work than now, when I work hardest. We know the reason. But, indeed, I have no time to be sick, if any illness wanted to take me. So you may unhesitatingly contradict those reports.

[1] *Campion*, p. 113.

[2] Dr. Gregory Martin, one of the translators of the Rheims-Douai Version of the Bible, did not, however, join the Society.

"About yourself and Lane. I can more reasonably rejoice in this than in the memory of my proctorship. You are seven—I congratulate you; I wish you were seventy times seven. Considering the goodness of the cause, the number is small, but considering the iniquity of the times it is not little, especially since you have all come within two years. If my memory is good, I remember all the names and your somewhat tall person.

"Your reflections on the tears of our orthodox countrymen are quite true—wavering minds, mischievous attachments, cowardly tempers, illogical intellects. But these things will carry them into port when our Lord gives a good wind. I have ended up my paper, so I will end. But I will give you a commission, since you have offered yourself to me. When I was at Rome I owed everything to the Rev. Father Ursnar. Tell him I have not forgotten him, and greet him most heartily in my name. Farewell. Prague. St. John Baptist's Day, 1577."[1]

Once out of the novitiate, Parsons began to study theology, and frequented the lectures given by Jesuits at the Roman College, which seminary had been intrusted to the Society by Pius IV. Here he attended the lectures of Bellarmine, Suarez, Clavius, and Pereira, who were then lecturing at the Roman College. He was ordained priest in 1578, being then in his thirty-third year, and was appointed one of the papal penitentiaries at St. Peter's, to hear the confessions of Englishmen. His superiors must have soon had a very high opinion of his capacity, for in the following year he was put in "charge of the novitiate of the second year."

And now, free from the restrictions of a novice, he began a correspondence with Dr. Allen, which was to bear fruit later on. At this time he also occupied himself with looking after the spiritual welfare of such of his countrymen as happened to be in Rome; and his unwearied charity to those in distress (always a characteristic of the man) gained him many friends. During these days there came to Rome a young Englishman, a Mr. George Gilbert, who had lately inherited considerable property in Suffolk. Father Parsons converted him.

[1] *Campion*, p. 20.

We have mentioned above a certain Gregory Martin whom Parsons and Campion were hoping to make a Jesuit. The English seminary at Douai which Allen had founded in 1568, on the plan laid down by Cardinal Pole in his visitation of 1556, was on the point of being driven from Douai. Gregory Martin, one of the first to join Allen, was sent to Rome (1576) to see if any arrangement could be made to transfer the seminary there. But the Cardinal of Guise offering hospitality at Rheims, Allen decided to move his establishment there, and from 1578 to 1593 the English seminary was fixed in that town. It had already become necessary, even while at Douai, to make another foundation elsewhere, and Rome seemed the natural place. Gregory XIII. was a friend to the seminary at Douai, and had (1575) been persuaded to grant it an annual pension of twelve hundred Roman crowns.[1]

The Pope was approached by Dr. Owen Lewis, afterwards Bishop of Cassano, one of the most prominent of the English exiles in Rome. Gregory willingly received the petition, and summoned Allen to Rome to advise on the undertaking. Allen arrived in Rome in the winter of 1575–76. The Pope's idea was to combine a seminary with the existing English hospital founded in 1362 by John Shepherd, a merchant of London, in place of the old Saxon foundation of King Ina (727), which had ceased to exist under Innocent III. (1204). The outlines of the new seminary were agreed upon during Allen's visit to Rome, and he arranged with Dr. Owen Lewis that, as soon as the college could be got ready, students from the mother college of Douai should be sent to start the new house. The first students left Douai for Rome on 16th August 1576, and one of them was the William Holt whose name appears in the course of this history. On 19th November Gregory Martin also left, in order to take part in the direction of the new college. Within three years no less than twenty-two students went from Douai to Rome. How the new house progressed can be gathered from a letter from Martin to Campion (21st May 1578.)

[1] Bartoli says that this pension was obtained by Mercurianus, the Jesuit general (lib. i. c. 10).

1285279

"Gregory Martin (Rome) to Campion.

"There is at Rome a colony sent from the Douai seminary composed of twenty-six persons, nearly all divinity students, some of whom live in the hospital with the brethren; but the greater part are in a house immediately adjoining the hospital, and by means of a passage which has been opened forming one building with it. Three fathers of your Society are there by command of the Pontiff, and at the request of the Cardinal Morone, the Protector. They superintend the studies, that the foundation of the new establishment may be well laid. The Pope assigns them at present a fixed pension of 100 crowns a month, that is as much as the Rheims seminary receives. Our friend Bristowe is expected at Rome before Michaelmas, to give the benefit of his experience, and also to help the seminary."[1]

In 1578, Dr. Maurice Clenock, a Welshman, was elected warden of the hospital, and appointed by the Pope rector of the college. But the two institutions did not get on together, and it was most likely at the suggestion of the three Jesuits who were now interested in the college, that "at Christmas 1578 a breve came out from the Pope's holiness commanding all the old chaplains to depart within fifteen days, and assigning all the rents of the hospital to the use of the seminary, which was presently obeyed by the said priests."[2] Parsons as regards the fact is right, but his date is wrong. The breve (bull) was dated 23rd April 1579, but was not published till 24th December of the following year, in order to secure the rights of the existing brethren.

In the early part of 1579 Martin writes to Campion: "There are at the present moment 42 of our students, most of them divines, one rector, three fathers of the Society, and six servants. They live in the hospital adjoining the house." The presence of the three Jesuits in the secular college, and of a Welsh rector over English youths, was the occasion of serious disturbances among the students; and, as often happens, small causes led to grave results. The whole nature of these disputes, which had a great effect upon Parsons, can be

[1] *Records of the English Catholics*, i. p. 316.
[2] Parsons' *Story of Domestical Difficulties*.

gathered from the careful summary made by Canon Tierney from the letters of Allen, Lewis, and Haddock one of the students. He says:

"It evidently appears, firstly, that the president, who had been originally appointed, in opposition to the advice, or at least to the opinion of Dr. Allen, was unqualified for the situation; secondly, that his administration excited the complaints of a large majority of the students, whose discontent was at length manifested in acts of open rebellion; thirdly, that the avowed object of the disaffected was to alter the government of the college, to remove Clenock, and place the house under the direction of the Jesuits; fourthly, that refusing to submit to the decision of the protector (Morone), and persisting in their opposition to the established authority of the president, they were ordered both by the protector and the Pope to leave the college; fifthly, that the Jesuits, who were aware of the object and had constantly seconded the efforts of the refractory, now openly proclaimed their friendship for the ejected scholars, and filled the pulpits of Rome with appeals on their behalf; sixthly, that the General of the Society, though he had previously found it necessary to 'forbid the fathers to meddle,' now publicly avowed his sympathy with the offenders, and privately employed the influence of his friends to combat the resolution of the Pontiff; seventhly, that the result of these proceedings was the recall and triumph of the disaffected, the removal of Dr. Clenock, and the appointment of a Jesuit, the Father Alphonso Agazzari; lastly, that Allen, Bristowe, and the leading members of Rheims, while they condemned the proceedings of the students, still rejoiced in the change that had been accomplished, that they regarded it as the realisation of their first and warmest wish; and they willingly forgot the 'hazardous and scandalous means' by which the revolution had been effected, in the contemplation of the advantages anticipated from the zeal and talents of the fathers."[1] Thus began a system which was the fruitful source of discord for years, namely, the training of the Clergy by men who, as was but natural, made the interests of their own Society their first aim, and who could only train men in the way they themselves had been

[1] *Tierney*, vol. ii. p. 175, note.

trained. The position of ruling the junior Clergy, in Rome and elsewhere, had such decided advantages, that in spite of all opposition and entreaty, once in possession, the Jesuits never relinquished their hold until the Suppression came in 1773. Dodd sums up the situation in these terms: "Indeed, it (the English college) was still to serve as a nursery for the Clergy; but yet the Jesuits reaped a double advantage by the change. The juniors of their Order had a maintenance and opportunity of improving themselves by being made tutors to the Clergy and *quasi* professors. Again, it became a kind of nursery to their Order, for very often those that were designed for the Clergy, before they had completed their studies, were enrolled among the Jesuits. But what chiefly was regarded as an advantage to their Society was to be masters and managers of the revenues belonging to the college."[1] To which we may add, the advantage of being at headquarters, with a claim to be heard in the affairs of the Clergy, and thus having practical control.

But what was Parsons doing all this time? Little or nothing is known; but it is not too much to suppose that, as far as his position allowed, he would be actively on the side of those who were favouring the malcontents. Indeed, More, in his *History of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, does give him a prominent part, in the matter of the seminary, saying, he counselled and exhorted the youths and induced two Jesuits who were intimate with the Pope (one afterwards became Cardinal Toledo) to use their influence on behalf of the students.[2] It must be remembered he had just devoted himself heart and soul to the Society, and it must have been in accord with his dearest wish to have his religious brethren in touch with English affairs by means of the seminary. Parsons' mind had not lost interest in his native land. In the first fervour of his novitiate he had, indeed, offered himself as a volunteer for the Indian mission; but the news of the success of the priests from Douai seminary, and of the heroic death of Cuthbert Mayne in November 1577, had sent a thrill of excitement and zeal through the hearts of the English Jesuits, and turned all thoughts to the English mission. The control

[1] *Tierney*, vol. ii. p. 171. [2] *Ibid.*

over the English seminary at Rome would be a step in the right direction, and would lead to a desirable end, which perhaps had already begun to show itself to Parsons, namely, that the Society should rule in England. This is not a mere conjecture; but it is based on the fact that about this time Parsons was turning over in his mind certain schemes afterwards to be embodied in his *Memorial for a Reformation of England.* That there would be a growth in these ideas, as circumstances favoured, is but natural; but the main features of the plan he afterwards attempted to carry out had already been conceived and approved of as desirable. His active brain was ever at work, even were it in theory only, to advance the interests of his Society, so convinced was he of its predestination, and that its glory was identical with that *greater* glory of God to which he had devoted himself. His mind was too acute to be content with one aspect of things; he must blend together many views until he could get one which, though complex in reality, was simple to him. And it was just this which led to misfortune. Parsons was essentially a man of his day, and was no clearer-headed than others. Secular and religious politics were to him inseparable. So, while honestly sharing in Campion's spiritual aspirations for the conversion of England, in the following letter we see he had one eye closely fixed on the political expedients through which alone it seemed possible. Parsons was no Seer: He went with the spirit of the day.

"Pax Ch.

"Having read this letter, almost a month agone, from Mr. Martin, I deferred to send it until this time, to the end I might accompany it with some news touching on English matters. You shall understand, therefore, that Sir Thomas Stewkly,[1]

[1] Gregory XIII., hoping to enforce the policy of Pius V., determined to strike a blow at England through Ireland, feeling sure that the Irish would rise if they were encouraged. Thomas Stukley, an English exile, received money from the Pope for an expedition to Ireland, but diverting it to an enterprise against the Moors, he there met his death. His confederate, James Fitzmaurice, brother of the Earl of Desmond, in June 1579, landed a few Spanish troops in Ireland, and took possession of Smerwick, near Kerry. Being killed in a skirmish, his brother the Earl revolted also, and a reinforcement of Spanish and Italian soldiers, in the pay of the Pope, was sent to Smerwick in 1580, with disastrous results, as will be seen in this narrative.

who was made here marquis before his departure, is now dead in Africa with the K. of Portugal. The particulars of his death we have not received. He took away with him at midnight out of their beds all the Irishmen in Rome, and one English gentleman named Mr. Minors, nephew to Cardinal Pole, who had good entertainment here of the Pope before—that is to say, xx crowns in gold a month. This Mynhurst, with one Sidgraves, an Irishman, which once had been of our Company, Sir Thomas being on the sea, upon what cause I know not, would have hanged them, and being prohibited to do it by the earnest request of some Italian captains that went with him, he deferred the work until he came to Portugal; and there arriving condemned both of them to the galleys for term of life, and so led them slaves with him into Africa; but since his death they are delivered by the new King of Portugal, which is the Cardinal; and this much Minors hath written hither himself, and other provisions that went with Sir Thomas, all is dispersed; and so this enterprise is come to nothing. Here, in Rome, the English seminary goeth forth well; for there be almost 40 persons under the government of iii of our Society. We are here at Rome now, 24 Englishmen of the Society, whereof five hath entered within this month. One named Mr. Holt, who was once of Oriel College, Master of Arts, and the other four came from Paris; all excellent towardly youths, and all have ended the courses of philosophia: ii of them are your countrymen, born in Paternoster Row; one named Harwood, and the other Smith, little Dr. Smith the physician's nephew. One English of good learning is presently now here hence sent towards Japponia. I hope, ere it be long, we shall (find) a vent another way. Father Darbishire is come hither from Paris, and it may be that I shall go, ere it be long, in his place thither. Mr. Lane, as I wrote to you before, is gone to Alcala in Spain, and arrived thither hath wrote your commendations in a letter to me. And this is as much as I have to write to you at this time. Mr. Martin was called away here hence by Mr. Dr. Allen his letters. I think they were half afraid of him, what might become of him; but Mr. Horltus (Holt?) entering of late hath much amazed them. I pray you, good Mr. Campion,

pray for me; for I have great need of it. All our countrymen here doth commend themselves heartily to you.—Your servant in Christ,

"ROBERT PARSONS."

"From Rome, the xxviii of November 1578."

Shortly after the date of this letter, the students of the English college at Rome came to the conclusion they had found in the Jesuit Superiors a King Stork in place of a King Log. This feeling was fomented by the anti-Jesuit party among the English exiles outside of the seminary; and now all the cry was to get rid of the Jesuit Superiors and restore the government to the Clergy, or give it to the Dominicans. It was also held, with reason, too, as it seems, that as the Jesuits took no part in the Mission to England, they were not the best trainers of those destined for that end. At this juncture Parsons comes distinctly on the scene; and the tone of the following letter (which reveals the experienced tutor and a man with ideas) implies that he was already engaged in the affairs of the English seminary, and on intimate terms with Dr. Allen, whose aid the Jesuits had now determined to invoke to put down the rebellion.

"GOOD MR. DOCTOR,—I shall not need to write much at this time, partly for that I suppose the priests and scholars do (and I have done also myself at other times), and partly for that I hope to see you here shortly, at what time we may more commodiously talk of all matters in presence; yet for that I am requested by some here to touch certain points unto you, I shall do it briefly, to wit, first, what hath passed here in this great contention; and, secondly, the importance of your speedy coming hither.

"For the first, though the issue of this contention hath brought forth some good effects for benefit of this new college which perhaps would not have ensued (or at least not so soon) if this sharp bickerment had not fallen out, yet have there many things passed therein which I could wish had been undone, or at least done with some more moderation on all hands, and this for the credit of our whole nation.

"Touching Mr. Morrice (*Dr. Maurice Clenock*), his government, I think verily and do partly know also that it was insufficient for such a multitude; and how could it be otherwise, he being alone without help, and never practised in such a manage before? The scholars also were very evil provided for necessaries, sometimes going all ragged, and in worse case, some of them at least (and those of the principal), as I have seen with mine eyes. National partialities also in distribution of things I think was not so carefully avoided as ought to have been. Yet could I have wished the scholars to have dealt more moderately for redress, if it might have been; and at least I would the difference between Welsh and English had not been so often named, or so much urged here among strangers, seeing that of both nations there be very good and virtuous people both at home and abroad, who by this open contention may be driven into division. But who can stay young men, or old either, once incensed on both sides by national contentions? You know what passeth at Oxford in like occasions.

"If I should tell you of particular excesses passed on both sides you would laugh; and yet it would grieve you as it doth me. When all the English were put out of the college, one Hugh Griffin, nephew to Mr. Archdeacon Lewis, is said to have given a leap in the college-hall, saying, 'Who now but a Welshman?'" [*Here follows a blank of a whole page in the MS. "Story of Domestical Difficulties," by Parsons, from which this letter is extracted.*] "Thus you see when national dissensions once raised up, how hard it is to appease it; for which cause the more necessary is thought your speedy repair hither; and to this end have we procured you both licence of His Holiness to come, and sent you also some *viaticum*; so as we trust to see you speedily.

"To show you here the commodities and utilities which may ensue of your journey, it shall be to small purpose, for your wisdom will far better conceive it than we. Yet these points have we proposed here to His Holiness and other superiors to consent and desire your coming. First, the pacifying of grudges between the two nations, seeing Mr. Dr. Lewis is your great friend; and then the uniting and com-

bining of this college to yours there in all good correspondence. And these two were sufficient for His Holiness; but further to ourselves we have proposed the confirmation and increase of that seminary's pension by His Holiness; the right informing also of Fr.-General of the Society in our English affairs, where perhaps you may induce him to join some of his also (seeing God has sent so many new into the Society) with our other priests to go into England, seeing otherwise you and others have written that it is much desired by Catholics there. And here I am sure there wanted not desire in divers to adventure their blood in that Mission, among whom I dare put myself for one, if holy obedience employ me therein; for seeing I have offered myself a good while ago to the Mission of the Indies and cannot obtain it, it may be God will have me go this other. But whether I go or no, I think the combination of our fathers of the Society with our priests of the seminaries is so important a thing and of so great consequence as if by your coming you brought no other things to pass but this, you would have well bestowed your time. But I hope you shall do this and much more; whereof we shall talk more largely at our meeting. And so to that time I remit all the rest, with my most hearty commendations to yourself and Mr. Dr. Bristowe, to Mr. Licentiate Martin, and all the rest.

"From Rome this 30th of March 1579.—Yours wholly ever,

"ROBERT PARSONS."[1]

Dr. Allen accordingly, at the end of that year, did go to Rome, and after consultations with Parsons, agreed that the best remedy for reconciling the factions was to secure the co-operation of Jesuits in the mission field. The proposal was laid before Mercurianus, the General, who debated the matter with his assistants, with Parsons, Allen, and Aquaviva, then Provincial of Rome, and afterwards General. There were many obvious arguments for sending Jesuits to England; and one

[1] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. ii. p. 74. Although no formal Mission had been sent to England, Jesuits had worked there. Allen writing 10th August 157 to Chauncey says: "One of which order being somewhat young but otherwis

which (judging from after events) emanated we should say from Parsons, was to the effect that as the Benedictines had converted England, so now the Jesuits might have the glory of regaining it. There were, however, grave reasons in the mind of the General against such a proposal. The men who were sent would go most likely on a mission of death; and it was doubtful whether the loss of so many would not outweigh the result of their labours. Again, the English Government, from the known Spanish origin and leanings of the Society, would not fail to attach a political significance to their Mission, which would prove a serious hindrance to the good which might otherwise be hoped for. Mercurianus, like Borgia, did not approve of political Jesuits. Again, the manner of life they would have to lead in England, living disguised, apart from one another, and keeping all sorts of doubtful company, were difficulties which seemed incompatible with the rules of the Society. "They would be overwhelmed with business; and there would be no facilities, as in India, for renewing their relaxing fervour by frequent retreats. They would have no rest, no silence; they would be in everlasting hurly-burly. And then they would be accused of treason, and hunted about as traitors. And on occasion of disputes with the other priests, there were no bishops in England to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and it seemed difficult to believe that so many priests and religious could live together in one realm without jars and discords."[1] How well the General foresaw the difficulties of the situation the event proved. It took a long time to get over them. As regards the last point, it was suggested (perhaps by Parsons) that a superior from among the priests should be set over the English Clergy. Here we have the first germ of the Archpriest policy. This was a novelty the Pope would not hear of; he decided to send Dr. Goldwell, the Marian bishop of St. Asaph, to act as Ordinary over the whole of England. Parsons and Allen found Aquaviva a valuable auxiliary in persuading the General;

exceedingly exercised was many days some years past in England, where he did reconcile many and did much good . . . myself heard ill spoken of him in England" (*sine causa*). *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 33.

[1] *Campion*, pp. 138, 139.

and the Provincial in his enthusiasm asked to be sent on the dangerous mission. Oliver Manareus, the Assistant for Germany, was also favourable to the project.

At last, some time before 9th December 1579, the matter was decided. The Society undertook to send subjects to England; and Parsons with Campion, who was summoned from Prague for the purpose, were appointed to be pioneers. Although he was junior to Campion in age and in the Society, Parsons was appointed the Superior. "Inferior in eloquence and in enthusiastic simplicity of purpose, he had a deeper knowledge of men and things, greater versatility, a finer and subtler policy, and as strong a will. He was also *notus Pontifici*, and the regulations of the Society say, 'those who are sent on missions should be exceedingly well known to the Superior.' Parsons had always lived in the metropolis, Campion had been buried in a distant province. . . . The rule prescribed that the missionaries should be at least two, and that for a very fervent and courageous man a cooler and more circumspect companion should be chosen; in this expedition the prudence was Parsons', the zeal Campion's."[1]

Thus Parsons had gained his desire. If the possible crown of martyrdom dazzled his eyes, he saw also in the decision a furtherance of the interests of his beloved Society. Enthusiasm, if such a thing could exist in his character, was tempered by cool deliberate prudence, and true zeal by a nice adjustment of means to the end.

The rich young Englishman, George Gilbert, had been desirous in the first fervour of his conversion to set out as a pilgrim to the Holy Land; but Parsons had persuaded him rather to return to England and expend his wealth for the advancement of the faith. So the material part of the enterprise was secured. When the Mission was decided upon Gilbert, who was then on the point of marriage, withdrew from his engagement and devoted himself to prepare the way for the Jesuits. He gathered together several Catholic young men of means, and formed them into a kind of sodality to assist the coming missioners. With characteristic boldness they took up their abode in Fetter or Chancery Lane, in the

[1] *Campion*, p. 150.

very house of the chief pursuivant, who enjoyed great credit with Aylmer, Bishop of London. They had also that bishop's son-in-law, Adam Squire, in their pay. Through the connivance of these men, the sodality was able to afford shelter to priests, and to have masses celebrated daily under the very eyes of those who ought to have arrested them.

A series of instructions were drawn up by the General for the guidance of the Jesuit missionaries, and Mr. Simpson, from a manuscript in the Royal Archives[1] at Brussels gives this summary: "They were reminded of the virtue and piety and of the prudence required for dwelling safely in a nation of shrewd, experienced, and unscrupulous enemies; to preserve the first they were to keep the rules of the Society as far as circumstances would allow; for the second, they were to study with whom, when, how, and about what things they were to speak, and to be especially careful never to commit themselves, either amid the temptations of good fellowship, or by hasty and immoderate zeal and heat. Their dress, though secular, was to be grave, and the habit of the Society was only to be worn when they were quite safe, and then only for sacred functions. If they could not live together, they were at least to visit one another frequently. With regard to their intercourse with strangers, they were to associate with men of the higher ranks, and rather with reconciled Catholics than with those who were still in schism. They were to have no personal dealings with heretics, but were to employ laymen to manage all the preliminaries of conversion, to which they were themselves only to put the finishing stroke. They were not to be ever ready to engage in controversy, and then were to abstain from all sarcasm, preferring solid answers to sharp repartees, and always putting first the very best and strongest arguments. They were to avoid familiar conversation with women and boys, to take special care never to deserve the reputation of chatter-boxes, or of alms or legacy hunters; 'they must so behave that all may see that the only gain they covet is that of souls.' They must not carry about anything forbidden by the penal laws, or anything which might compromise them, as letters; except for the strongest reasons, they

[1] *Inventaires des Archives de la Province des Jesuites*, No. 1085.

must never let it be publicly known that they were Jesuits, o even priests. 'They must not mix themselves up with affair of State, nor write to Rome about political matters, nor speal nor allow others to speak in their presence against the Queer except perhaps in the company of those whose fidelity ha been long and steadfast; and even then, not without stron reason.' . . . They were 'to ask the Pope for an explanatio of the declaration of Pius v. against Elizabeth, which th Catholics desired to have thus explained: That it shoul always bind her and the heretics; but that it should in n way bind the Catholics while things remained as they are but only then when public execution of the said bull shall b possible.'"[1] That there was a special meaning to be attache to the phrase, "while things remain as they are," will be see clearly in the course of this history.

[1] *Campion*, pp. 139–141. Pius v. by his bull had not only excommunicated th Queen, but all who acknowledged and obeyed her. "Campion, on his first arriv in Rome (1572), had been questioned by Cardinal Gesualde about the practical effects this bull, and had declared it caused great evil to the Catholics; he told him that th bull might be so mitigated as to allow Catholics to acknowledge the Queen witho censure"; and now before going to England he asked for and obtained only th mitigation, not probably because it was all he thought useful, but because it was a he could hope to get (*ibid.* p. 141).

CHAPTER IV

THE JESUIT MISSION

On Low Sunday, which that year (1580) fell on the 18th of April, Parsons and Campion, together with a Jesuit lay brother, Ralph Emerson, knelt before Gregory XIII. to get his blessing before starting on their enterprise. Already had they received ample faculties, and the power, which was afterwards found so useful, of communicating them to the Clergy of England, Ireland, and Scotland.[1]

It must be borne in mind that these two Jesuits were only a small part of the band of missionaries the Pope was sending into England at the same time. Although they had secured faculties more ample than the rest, in no sense were they sent in any position of authority or superiority over the Clergy. Bishop Goldwell, who was of the party, was the only superior Rome at that time sent to England. Parsons only had as subjects his fellow-Jesuits, Campion and Emerson.

On the very day the party left Rome, one of the exiles in Rome, Robert Owen, wrote to Dr. Humphrey Ely at Rheims saying: "My Lord of St. Asaph and Mr. Dr. Martin are gone hence, some say to Venice, some to Flanders, and so further; which if it be true you shall know sooner than we here. God send them well to do whithersoever they go, and specially if they be gone to the harvest. The sale that Mr. Dr. Morton made of all his things maketh many think *quod non habet animum revertendi.* This day depart hence many of our countrymen thitherward and withall good Father Campion."[2] This letter fell into the hands of the English Government, and was the first intimation they had of the

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. (14th April 1580), vol. 137, Nos. 26–28.

[2] *Ibid.* vol. 137, No. 38.

coming expedition. It was quickly followed by a list of th little party from one of Walsingham's spies.[1]

Parsons, somehow or other, seems from the first to hav secured the lead, at anyrate, of those who travelled on foo Bishop Goldwell and Dr. Morton had gone on ahead, trave ling on horseback. Parsons says: "It was thought convenien that each priest should change his long apparel both for bett travelling a-foot as also not so easily to be discovered Germany, and some other places where priests are litt favoured"; and remarks that Campion would only accept some old buckram clothes, saying: "That to him that wer to be hanged in England any apparel was sufficient." The also changed their names, and Parsons began that long li of aliases which, until late years, has obscured his proceedings For the first eight or ten days after leaving Rome, they ha to make their way through continual rain, which drenche them to the skin. At Bologna a halt was made; for Parson had met with an accident to his leg, and rest was necessar The Jesuits carried letters of introduction from Fr. Agazza rector of the English college, to Cardinal Paleotto, the arch bishop, and he received them for some days in his palac During this enforced delay Campion wrote to some friends his at Prague, and in the course of his letter says: "I am no at Bologna, on my return from Rome, and on the way to m warfare in England. Whatever becomes of me, our posteri survives. You would hardly believe me if I told you wh comfort I feel when I think of them. If they were n Englishmen I would say more about them. In this expediti there are two fathers of the Society, Robert Parsons an myself, seven other priests and three laymen, one of whom also of us. I see them all so prodigal of blood and life th

[1] Walsingham had reduced the system of spying to great perfection. Writing a later date, the Jesuit Fr. Blount tells Parsons that the Secretary could discover most secret business transacted at the papal Court before it was known to Catholics in England. He could intercept letters written from Paris to Brussels from Rome to Naples. See Gerard's *What was the Gunpowder Plot*, quoting from Stonyhurst MS. (p. 77).

[2] The following names have been identified with Parsons: Robert, Perin Ralph, Stefano Cornelio, Ottaviano Inghelberto, Richard Melino, Mar Mercante, Rowland Cabel, John Howlett, Redman, Giacomo Creletto, Sign O. Hamiano, Eusebius.

I am ashamed of my backwardness. I hope to be with Allen at Rheims in the beginning of June. We all travel at the Pope's cost. Though we shall fall at the first onset, yet our army is full of fresh recruits, by whose victory our ghosts will be pacified."[1] The date of this letter is the last day of April 1580.

From Bologna they made their way to Milan, where the good cardinal, Charles Borromeo, was archbishop. He received them with joy into his house, and kept them with him for eight days. He had always borne a special love towards exiles from England, and employed them in his own household. Some time after the visit he wrote to Agazzari: "I saw, and willingly received those English who departed hence the other day as their goodness deserved, and the cause for which they had undertaken that voyage. If, in future your reverence sends any others to me, be assured that I shall take care to receive them with all charity, and that it will be most pleasing to me to have occasion to perform the duties of hospitality, so proper for a bishop towards the Catholics of that nation. Milan, the last of June 1580."[2]

Leaving Milan, and passing by Turin, Parsons and his companions began the ascent over Mount Cenis, "all in health and apt to travel," and made their way by long marches into Savoy. Learning from some Spanish troops at Aiguebelle that the road by Lyons was dangerous, as the peasants of Dauphiné were in insurrection, they deliberated on the course to pursue. At last it was resolved to travel by Geneva openly as Catholics; for although it was the headquarters of the Calvinists it was a free city, and by law all travellers were allowed to remain three days. They had also a natural curiosity to interview Theodore Beza, then the head of the Calvinists. Disguising themselves as best they could by making the necessary alterations in their dress, they approached the city, and were taken at once by the town guards before the magistrates and ministers assembled in the market-place. There they were asked who and what they were, and why they travelled by this particular route. They openly professed they were Catholics, and "had lived for divers years

[1] *Campion*, p. 155. [2] *Records*, vol. i. p. 339.

in Italy, and are going now towards the English seminar in Rheims, but are obliged to pass by Geneva to avoid th Spanish soldiers and Dauphinese insurgents." Their explana tion was courteously received, and a soldier ordered to condu them to an inn, with instructions that they were to be we used. This was in the morning about eleven o'clock. A soon as they had dined, Parsons and others set out to vis Beza. His wife opened the door and showed them into small court, and told them to wait there till Beza came t them. He had, it appears, already heard about them fro the magistrates, and was not very willing to receive ther However, "when he came forth in his long black gown an round cap, with ruffles about his neck, and his fair, lon beard, he saluted them courteously, but did not invite ther into his house to sit down, but remained on foot and aske them what they would have. They told him that bein scholars and passing by Geneva they could do no less tha come to see him, for the fame they had heard in England his name. He answered that he understood it was far greate than he deserved; that he loved all Englishmen heartily, bu was sorry to hear his visitors were not of the religion of the country. They answered that their country was large, an held more sorts than one; that they kept to the religion which it was first converted from paganism, but that if h could show more weighty reasons to the contrary they wou be content to hear him."[1] Then Parsons began to attac him on questions of Church government; but Beza, puttin these questions aside, as matters of discipline and not doctrine, excused himself from further discussion, having ju received letters from France which he must needs answe And so he dismissed them.

The news of their arrival in the town quickly spre among the English residents, who came to the inn to s them. Among these was one Mr. Powell, an old Oxfo friend of Parsons and Campion. "So Parsons and the re walked about the town with them, and had much famili speech, which ended in an invitation to supper; however, Pow and the rest would not sup with them, but promised to cor

[1] *Campion*, p. 161.

afterwards."[1] When they came, a hot controversy began and was carried on in the streets till nearly midnight. Elated, the Catholics sent a challenge to Beza to meet them in public disputation, with the conditions "that he who was justly convicted in the opinion of indifferent judges should be burnt alive in the market-place." Powell, on hearing this, told Parsons that this would surely bring them into trouble with the municipal authorities, and induced him to leave the town as soon as possible. The next morning the party left early, rejoicing at their escape. But to punish themselves for a curiosity, which very nearly led them into trouble, they made a pilgrimage to St. Clodove in France, about eight or nine miles off.

They then travelled on slowly, and, nearly six weeks after their departure from Rome, arrived at Rheims on 31st May. Here they were welcomed by Allen and his companions at the English college; and here, unaccountable as it seems, they first heard of some most serious news which was sure to compromise their Mission. Parsons, in his manuscript *Life of Campion*, thus refers to it: "Dr. Allen also told us that he had heard from Spain that Dr. Sanders was just gone into Ireland, by the nuncio, Mgr. Sega's orders, to comfort and assist the Earl of Desmond, Viscount Ballinglas, and others that had taken arms in defence of their religion, and had asked the Pope's help, counsel, and comfort in that cause. Though it belonged not to us to mislike this journey of Dr. Sanders, because it was made by order of his superiors, yet were we heartily sorry, partly because we feared that which really happened—the destruction of so rare and worthy a man—and partly because we plainly foresaw that this would be taken in England as though we had been privy or partakers thereof, as in very truth we were not, nor ever heard or suspected the same until this day. But as we could not remedy the matter, and as our consciences were clear, we resolved through evil report and good report to go on with the purely spiritual action we had in hand; and if God destined any of us to suffer under a wrong title, it was only what He had done, and would be no loss to us, but rather gain, in His eyes, who knew

[1] *Ibid.* p. 163.

the truth, and for whose sake alone we had undertaken thi enterprise."[1]

It can be now seen what was the meaning of the phras "while things remain as they are," in the explanation of th bull of Pius V. At the very moment while the Pope wa sending to England the missionaries on a purely spiritua errand, the *Curia* had another enterprise of a political natur the temporal conquest of England. Ireland was to be th point of attack. The *Curia* provided the money, som 230,000 scudi, and five ships full of soldiers and munition; and by a breve dated 13th May 1580, a plenary indulgenc was granted to all those who helped the Irish rebels "wit counsel, favour, supplies, arms, or in any other way." Th English Government knew all about the expedition, and sa through the Italian diplomacy; they very naturally also cor nected it with the Mission of the Jesuits.[3]

The stay at Rheims was not long. Here they met Bisho Goldwell, who had preceded them from Rouen. He was i and unable to proceed.[4] Hence the new Mission to Englan was without an episcopal superior, and the position was le open to him who knew how to use it to advantage. Th party split up, deeming it wiser to venture into England b different routes. The Jesuits went on 6th June to St. Omer travelling through "a country filled with soldiers of dive sorts and conditions, but all perilous to one who should fa into their hands; but their lot was cast, and they depende on the Master and Commander of all, who led them throug

[1] *Ibid.* p. 146. [2] Theiner, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, vol. iii. p. 217.

[3] "It is not difficult to understand," says Mr. Simpson, "into what a false positi the Jesuits and other missionaries were thrown by the Irish expedition, and h entirely they were compromised. Imposed upon themselves, it was their mission impose upon others likewise, and to make-believe that the bull was so modified as render the relations between Pope and Queen compatible with the continual allegiar of Catholics. Yet, after all, this famous mitigation amounted in reality to no m than an ill-conceived attempt to pretend to be at peace with the Queen of Englar while open war was being made on her in Ireland. And yet there can be no dou that this double dealing was a strictly logical result of the attempt to guarantee Pope's spiritual power through his temporal power," etc. (pp. 145, 146).

[4] "Before he recovered, the persecution in England had grown to be so rigor that it seemed not good to the Pope to adventure a man of that age and dignity to turbulent a time, and so called him back to Rome, where he lived in the love of men and in universal opinion of sanctity till his death in 1584."

without hurt, stay, or trouble." There was a Jesuit residence at St. Omers, and the fathers there did all they could to dissuade Parsons from attempting to enter England. News had been received that a full and particular description of Parsons and Campion was furnished to the Queen's Council, and that information, and even portraits of the expected Jesuits, had been sent to all Government searchers at the ports. But Parsons pleaded that if the entrance was dangerous now, it would only be more so later on; they could change their names and disguise themselves as they would. After consulting with some of the English residents in St. Omers, it was agreed that Parsons by himself should make the attempt; and, if he succeeded, send over for Campion. The two Jesuits disguised themselves. Campion, the pious enthusiastic missioner, choosing, when his turn came, the character of a merchant of jewels; while Parsons, setting out to conquer England for his Society, chose the appropriate part of a soldier.

Putting on a suit of buff "laid with gold lace, with hat and feathers suited to the same," and thus disguised as a captain returning from the Lowlands, he set out with a servant-man, George, and "passed to Calais upon St. Barnaby's Day as I remember being the xi of June; and finding fit embarkation and passage, the very next morning arrived at Dover."[1] The searcher "found no cause of doubt in him, but let him pass with all favour," procuring him horse and all other things necessary for his journey to Gravesend. Parsons boldly told the searcher "that he had a certain friend, a merchant, lying in St. Omers, that would follow him very shortly; to whom he desired the said searcher to show all favour; and so he promised to do, and took a certain letter of the same father to send to

[1] Campion writing to the General on 20th June says: "Father Robert with Brother George his companion had sailed from Calais after midnight, on the day before I began to write this; the wind was very good, so we hope he reached Dover some time yesterday morning, the 16th of June. He was dressed up like a soldier—such a peacock, such a swagger, that a man needs must have very sharp eyes to catch a glimpse of any holiness and modesty shrouded beneath such a garb, such a look, such a strut. Yet our minds cannot but misgive us when we hear all men, I will not say whispering, but crying the news of our coming" (More, *Historia Provinciæ Anglicæ Societatis Jesu*, p. 63).

Mr. Edmunds (for so Father Campion was now called), and conveyed it safely to St. Omers, in which letter Father Parsons wrote unto him the great courtesy which the searcher had shown him," and recommended him to hasten and follow him up to London, where he might assist him in disposing of his stock of jewels and diamonds.

There is a certain grim humour in thus employing the very Government officials to assist the entry of the much dreaded Jesuits.

Making his way through the fair garden of Kent, on the horse so thoughtfully provided, Parsons arrived at Gravesend late at night, where he had to leave his horse, and taking advantage of a tilt-boat travelled by water up to town. There were many passengers on board, lawyers and courtiers who were returning from a merry-making, and kept playing and singing half through the night. "Parsons, in dread of being recognised in the daylight, took the opportunity, before the gentlemen were awake, of jumping into a wherry, which landed him and his man in Southwark about four in the morning. But here he was in fresh difficulties; he had no horse, and so was not acceptable to the hosts of the inns, who were, moreover, made extraordinarily cautious by the late proclamations and rumours against suspicious people; besides they saw that his dress was outlandish, and one and all refused to harbour him."[1]

Wandering about all the morning, he at last bethought himself of the Marshalsea, where there were many Catholic prisoners. They, he was sure, would direct him to some safe house. He asked for a certain Thomas Pounde, who for many years had been a prisoner for conscience' sake. By him Parsons was introduced to the other Catholic prisoners, and dined with them. He was afterwards taken by one of the visitors, Edward Brooks, a member of George Gilbert's sodality, to the house which had been provided. Here he was at once among friends who had been anxiously expecting him, and who now provided for all his wants. But Parsons had come to work, and would not lose time. So giving instructions about Campion, who might now be expected any day, the Jesuit set out in the compa

[1] *Campion*, p. 172.

of Henry Orton, one of Gilbert's young men, to visit certain families in the counties near London. He intended to be away about three weeks, but left word if Campion came during his absence he was to employ his time in comforting the Catholics in London. Campion, not without adventure, arrived in London on 26th June, and at once made a great impression by a sermon he preached on the 29th. The arrival of the Jesuits was a grand secret which half the world knew; and the Council were not behindhand in setting their spies to work. The search became so hot that on Parsons' return it was deemed wiser to shorten their stay in London. But before leaving there was a difficulty to be got round. The old Marian priests, as a body, were somewhat suspicious of the new men. What they had learnt of them from the seminary priests (now some four-score or more), who had come to work in England, made them apprehensive of danger. The ways and the ideas of the Society were so very different from anything hitherto seen in England; and then, besides, there was more than a feeling that their coming had some political meaning which would only bring more trouble and persecution on the already sorely tried flock. This led to a deeper question, which called for immediate consideration. The feeling, as can be gathered from the point principally raised, was not what excuse the Jesuits could give, but whether it would be wise to allow them to be in England at all, seeing the state of the country at the moment. The Clergy doubted whether defying of the Government by an ostentatious flaunting of Jesuit missionaries in their very face would not do more harm than good to the Catholic cause. To meet this opposition from within, Father Parsons needed all his diplomatical address; and the perfect ingenuousness and open simplicity of his companion were great aids. Whether Parsons had from the beginning devoted himself to political ventures may be, perhaps to some, an open question. I think he did; and I have shown that he had already been planning a mode of procedure. But at any rate it must be remembered that before that year was out, within a few months of his arrival, he was in the very midst of political intrigues.

A meeting was therefore convened in a small house in

Southwark of the gravest of the old Marian priests then in London, and "divers principal laymen, for their better satisfaction; for that sundry points of importance were to be discussed." Among the "old" priests present was Mr. George Blackwell, afterwards the Archpriest. He, at this time, seems not to have been very favourable to the Jesuits, and is reported to have said that it was a very unwise thing to have sent Parsons into England, where his turbulent behaviour at Oxford was still remembered. Parsons says in his *Story of Domestical Troubles* that at his entrance into England (it was probably at this very meeting) "a very grave and antient priest, Mr. Wilson, not so much in his own name as of others by whom he was sent, proposed the matter to Fr. Parsons, namely, that the fathers should leave England again until a calmer time. But this was evaded by the assembly, and they proceeded to discuss certain points.

The first question raised at this meeting was the answer to be made, for the common satisfaction, to the rumours that the Jesuits had come for matters of state, not for religion; for, if this were so, the Clergy felt that "all their spiritual and ecclesiastical functions might be brought into obloquy and hatred with the people, and much cruelty inflicted both on the said Clergy and themselves when they should be taken, and on all other Catholics for their sakes." To this the Jesuits said they had only one answer to make. They made oath there and then before all the assembly that "their coming was only apostolical, to treat of matters of religion in truth and simplicity and to attend to the gaining of souls, without any pretence or knowledge of matters of state." They produced the instructions they had received from the General, and declared that they first heard at Rheims of Dr. Sander's mission to Ireland. In case they fell into the hands of the State they would defend themselves on oath, and challenge anyone to prove anything against them; and if the matter went, as was likely, by mere conjecture, they would bring conjecture against conjecture, and probability against probability. They argued, if they were political agents they must be sent to Catholics; and what Catholics would listen to them, or give credence to what they said, if, after the solemn

oath they had just taken, they were to be found dabbling in politics?

The next point to be discussed was that so often debated —could Catholics, under the present circumstances, be permitted to attend the Protestant services? All that Elizabeth's Government then required was outward conformity to the State religion. Could Catholics, therefore, pay this external act of obedience? It must be remembered, if the Government's sole policy was outward agreement, the Anglican bishops and ministers were just as much bent upon enforcing inward conformity. The question had been discussed and settled in the negative, long before Parsons came to England. It now came up again. Maybe when the dispensation from the bull of Pius V. was announced it was thought that something of the same sort might be obtained "while things remained as they were." But Parsons had known the danger of conforming against conscience. He said that the Pope would never grant a dispensation in such cases; for going to the Protestant church was an open denial of the true religion. The matter had been discussed at the Council of Trent, and the conclusion arrived at there was, that nothing could justify Catholics attending such services.

A third and practical point was also settled. The new seminary priests and the Jesuits had been brought up abroad, and had learnt other customs than those of their Catholic forefathers. Were the old English laws of fasting still to be followed, or the more lenient customs learnt in Italy? A compromise was made; for the old priests clung fondly to the national works of piety. Nothing was to be altered for the present; but, where the old customs remained, there the priests were to be the most forward in observing them. But where, by lapse of time, the custom was dropped, then the new fashion was to be adopted. This was, of course, a shelving of the whole question.

It was agreed that three districts required to be specially provided for: Wales, Lancashire and the North, and Cambridge. The Clergy devoted themselves to these parts, while Parsons left himself free to visit the whole country. He evidently had made up his mind by this time. And perhaps

the helplessness displayed at this meeting, where there was no head or authority, caused him boldly to take the reins into his own hands. If he had donned a captain's dress when entering England, he was going to live up to the position.

This meeting took place early in July; and as soon as it was over Parsons and Campion, having settled their own plans, parted at Hogsden, a village near London. Gilbert provided Parsons with two horses, a servant, two suits of clothes, sixty pounds in money, books, vestments, and all things necessary. His generosity provided for Campion in like manner. But just before parting, Thomas Pounde, who had found some means of temporary escape from the Marshalsea, came to implore them to take some steps for counteracting the rumours which were daily gaining credit that the Jesuits had come over on a political errand. These reports were sure to grow during their absence. The only remedy was, he said, for each of the fathers to write a brief declaration of the true cause of his coming, and leave it signed and sealed with some friend, who could, in case of necessity, produce it, and thus at least shield his good name. Parsons wrote one, which is now at Stonyhurst; and Campion dashed off his in half an hour. Keeping the original, he gave a copy to Pounde, which Parsons took care to seal. It was addressed to the Council in the following terms:—

"RIGHT HONOURABLE,—Whereas I have, out of Germany and Boeme-land, being sent by my superiors, adventured myself into this noble realm, my dear country, for the glory of God and benefit of souls, I thought it like enough that, in this busy, watchful, and suspicious world, I should sooner or later be interrupted and stopped of my course. Wherefore, providing for all events, and uncertain what may become of me when God shall haply deliver my body into durance, I supposed it needful to put this writing in a readiness, desiring your good lordships to give it the reading and to know my cause. This doing, I trust I shall ease you of some labour for that which otherwise you must have sought by practice of wit, I do now lay into your hands by plain confession. And to the intent this whole matter may be conceived in order, and

so the better both understood and remembered, I make thereof these nine points or articles, directly, truly, and resolutely opening my full enterprise and purpose.

"1. I confess that I am, albeit unworthy, a priest of the Catholic Church, and, through the great mercies of God, vowed now these eight years into the religion of the Society of Jesus; and thereby have taken upon me a special kind of warfare under the banner of obedience, and eke resigned all my interest and possibility of wealth, honour, pleasures, and other worldly felicities.

"2. At the voice of our General Provost, which is to me a warrant from Heaven and an oracle of Christ, I took my voyage from Prague to Rome, where our said General Father is alway resident, and from Rome to England, as I might and would have done joyously into any part of Christendom or Heathenesse, had I been thereto assigned.

"3. My charge is, of free cost to preach the Gospel, to minister the sacraments, to instruct the simple, to reform sinners, to confute errors, and, in brief, to cry alarm spiritual against foul vice and proud ignorance, wherewith many my dear countrymen are abused.

"4. I never had mind, and am straitly forbid by our fathers that sent me, to deal in any respects with matters of state or policy of this realm, as those things which appertain not to my vocation, and from which I do gladly estrange and sequester my thoughts.

"5. I ask, to the glory of God, with all humility, and under your correction, three sorts of indifferent and quiet audience. The first before your honours; wherein I shall discourse of religion so far as it toucheth the commonwealth and your nobilities. The second, whereof I make most account, before 'the doctors and masters and chosen men of both universities; wherein I undertake to avow the faith of our Catholic Church by proofs invincible, scriptures, councils, fathers, histories, natural and moral reason. The third, before the lawyers spiritual and temporal; wherein I will justify the said faith by the common wisdom of the laws standing yet in force and practice.

"6. I would be loth to speak anything that might sound

of an insolent brag or challenge, especially being now as a dead man to this world, and willing to cast my head under every man's foot, and to kiss the ground he treads upon. Yet have I such a courage in advancing the majesty of Jesus, my King, and such affiance in His gracious favour, and such assurance in my quarrel, and my evidence so impregnable because I know perfectly that none of the Protestants, nor all the Protestants living, nor any sect of our adversaries (howsoever they face men down in pulpits, and overrule us in their kingdom of grammarians and unlearned ears), can maintain their cause in disputation. I am to sue most humbly and instantly for the combat with all and every of them, or with the principal that may be found of them; protesting that in this trial the better furnished they come, the better welcome they shall be to me.

"7. And because it hath pleased God to enrich the Queen my sovereign lady with noble gifts of nature, learning, and princely education, I do verily trust, that if her highness would vouchsafe her royal person and good attention to such a conference as in the second part of my fifth article I have mentioned and requested, or to a few sermons which in her or your hearing I am to utter, such a manifest and fair light, by good method and plain dealing, may be cast upon those controversies, that possibly her zeal of truth and love of her people shall incline her noble grace to disfavour some proceedings hurtful to the realm, and procured towards us oppressed more equity.

"8. Moreover, I doubt not but you, her honourable Council, being of such wisdom and drift in cases most important, when you shall have heard these questions of religion opened faithfully, which many times by our adversaries are huddled up and confounded, will see upon what substantial grounds our Catholic faith is builded, and how feeble that side is which by sway of the time prevaileth against us; and so at last, for your own souls, and for many thousand souls that depend upon your government, will discountenance error when it is bewrayed, and hearken to those which spend the best blood in their bodies for your salvation. Many innocent hands are lifted up unto heaven for you daily and hourly, by those

English students whose posterity shall not die, which, beyond the seas, gathering virtue and sufficient knowledge for the purpose, are determined never to give you over, but either to win you to Heaven or to die upon your pikes. And touching our Society, be it known unto you, that we have made a league—all the Jesuits in the world, whose succession and multitude must overreach all the practices of England—cheerfully to carry the cross that you shall lay upon us, and never to despair your recovery while we have a man left to enjoy your Tyburn, or to be racked with your torments, or to be consumed with your prisons. The expense is reckoned, the enterprise is begun; it is of God, it cannot be withstood. So the faith was planted; so it must be restored.

"9. If these my offers be refused and my endeavours can take no place, and I having run thousands of miles to do you good, shall be rewarded with rigour,—I have no more to say, but to recommend your case and mine to Almighty God, the searcher of hearts, who send us His grace and set us at accord before the Day of Payment, to the intent we may at last be friends in heaven where all injuries shall be forgotten."

This declaration, which became known as Campion's "Brag and Challenge," is a sign of the sincerity of the writer. If it got abroad, all the better for the other designs which Parsons had locked up in his own heart. It never appears that he made Campion a confidant of his political practices.

Thus they parted. "All the summer we passed in preaching," says Parsons. "My lot was the shires of Northampton, Derby, Worcester, Gloucester, Hereford. Mr. Gilbert was my companion." Disguised now as a soldier, now as a gentleman, a minister, or lawyer, the Jesuits went from one Catholic house to another, saying Mass, administering the sacraments, counselling, consoling, and instructing. To do this with safety to themselves, and also to their hosts, who required to have proof that the strangers were really Jesuits, it was necessary that they should be conducted by some one who was well known and could answer for their identity. The state of the English Catholics in those days is well known, and it is hardly necessary here to detail it. During the twenty years of

Elizabeth's reign, outward conformity had done its work with most of the people. If, at the bottom, they were Catholics, and would hail with pleasure a return to the old ways, it must be remembered there was a generation growing up who never knew those old ways save by hearsay.

Parsons, however, describes the fervour of the Catholics in the following terms: "It fills me with amazement when I behold and reflect upon the devotion which Catholics in England show by their gestures and behaviour at Mass, for they are so overpowered by such a sense of awe and reverence that when they hear the name of the Pope pronounced in the Office they beat their breast; and when the Lord's Body is elevated, they weep so abundantly as to draw tears even involuntarily from my dry and parched eyes."[1]

If some were faithful, the rest had drifted into Protestantism, because they saw no chance of living as Catholics. These were the care of the Clergy. The Jesuits attended to the upper classes and such of the nobility as had not been ruined by the fines and exactions which now overwhelmed recusants. If the day dawned when things should cease to be as they were, Parsons foresaw he would have to rely on the rich. Day by day as he rode along the roads and the green lanes of England, he saw, or thought he saw, that the only way of achieving the conversion of the country was to work for the overthrow of Elizabeth. Therefore, besides his spiritual work, he must aim at sounding men by probing their inmost thoughts (they were only too glad to be directed by one who had no small reputation for solving doubts of conscience), and see whether he could not organise a party to rely upon whenever the Pope gave the signal for the attack. He was so carried away with this idea, and the old Puritan spirit, sublimated as it was with his view of the Society, took such possession of his soul, that he seems to have entirely forgotten the instructions he had received from the General, and his recent oath. He began, acting in the very teeth of obedience, the political career which has brought such discredit on his cause.

To carry out all this, Parsons found an invaluable help

[1] *Records of English Catholics*, i. p. lxi.

Gilbert's sodality of young men. They were the go-betweens the Jesuits and Catholics, or such Protestants who might honestly be desiring conference or religion. The members of this association were "young gentlemen of great zeal and forwardness in religion," of birth and property, and free from the cares of family and place. Their names comprise, among others, such as Arundel, Vaux, Throgmorton, Babington, Tichborne, Abingdon, Tresham, Fitzherbert, and Stonor. And it will be noticed that some of the names were to be familiar as principals in some of the political plots of the near future. The existence of the sodality soon became known to the Government, and the names are found in State Papers and in Watson's *Quodlibets* as "subseminaries," "conductors," "companions and comforters of priests," "lay brothers." The Jesuits were accused of getting "either all or most part of their riches" before turning them into their officers and solicitors, "inferior agents," "lay assistants," who were to "straggle abroad and bring in game," and whose business was "not to argue, but to pray in corners, to get men to entertain conference of the priest, or to inveigle youths to fly over sea to the seminaries." They were in truth all this and something more, —a band of generous, brave, and devoted English youths, whose zeal sometimes outran their discretion, and whose existence as a secret society soon fell under the fate of all such. It became one with political aims.

There are many stories told of Parsons' escapes during his missionary expedition. One will serve to show the man's extraordinary presence of mind. One day, halting at a roadside inn, while ordering refreshment, he saw on the wall a coarsely drawn portrait of himself, copies of which the Council had scattered up and down the land. Pulling it down with his stick and trampling on it, he exclaimed: "How now, sirrah, do you mean to insult your customer by having such a villain's picture in your house?" and blustering and fuming, he took care to destroy it, lest the resemblance should be noticed.

His presence was dangerous not only to himself, but to those who sheltered him. He thus described what must have been no unusual scene: "Sometimes when we were sitting merrily at table, conversing familiarly on matters of faith and

devotion (for our talk is generally of such things), there comes a hurried knock at the door, like that of a pursuivant. All start up and listen—like deer when they hear the huntsman; we leave our food and commend ourselves to God in a brief ejaculation; nor is word or sound heard till the servants come to say what the matter is. If it is nothing, we laugh at our fright."

The Queen's Council had known of the Jesuits' departure from London, and pursuivants were sent to every county with warrants for their apprehension. But Parsons says: "They lost their labour, and we had three or four months free to follow our business, in which period, by the help and direction of the young gentlemen that went with us, we passed through the most part of the shires of England, preaching and administering the sacraments in almost every gentleman's and nobleman's house that we passed by, whether he was a Catholic or not, provided that he had any Catholics in his house to hear us. We entered for the most part as acquaintance or kinsfolk of some person that lived within the house, and when that failed us, as passengers or friends of some gentlemen who accompanied us; and after ordinary salutations we had our lodgings by procurement of the Catholics within the house, in some part retired from the rest, where, putting ourselves in priests' apparel and furniture, which we always carried with us, we had secret conference with the Catholics that were there, or such of them as might conveniently come, whom we ever caused to be ready for that night late, to prepare themselves for the sacrament of confession; and the next morning, very early, we had Mass and the blessed Sacrament ready for such as could communicate, and after that an exhortation; and then we made ourselves ready to depart again. And this was the manner of proceeding when we stayed least; but when there was longer and more liberal stay, then these exercises were more frequent."

The Government had already issued proclamations against the Jesuits, ordering their apprehension on the score of treason. And looking at the matter from Elizabeth's point of view, it

[1] It was about this time that the popular name of "Jebusites" was applied to the Jesuits in the doggerel ballads of the day.

difficult to see what else the Government could have done. The Pope was a declared enemy of the English Queen, and was already stirring up rebellion in her dominions. These Jesuits had come from Rome itself, and though they professed only spiritual business, it seemed clear to all men that they had another object also in view. The old priests had scented the danger; and it was not to be supposed that the Government was less acute. Putting aside the question of religion altogether, "as things now stood," the liberty of England was bound up with the safety of the Queen; and any movement which tended to attack her position was treason against the whole land. The Government were not then in a position to distinguish between the doings of Parsons and those of Campion; and it was but natural that the aims of the two should be considered identical. Here was the misfortune; and the innocent had to suffer for the guilty. Without a doubt, Parsons was a traitor as things were then; but Campion as certainly was not. When people put themselves into a false position they should not complain if those they attack do not take the trouble to make distinctions between "evil communications" and "good manners."

The declaration of Campion was to be the cause of more mischief. When Thomas Pounde got back to the Marshalsea, he read, and was so delighted with Campion's paper, that he incontinently challenged two Puritan ministers, who attended the prison, to controvert it; and presented petitions to the Council and to the Bishop of London for public disputations. These petitions were made, he said, "in the further behalf (as it may be presumed) of a perpetual corporation and succession of learned fathers, as any without comparison in the world." This reckless behaviour convinced the Council, if need be, that an attempt of more serious import was at hand. They ordered Pounde to be removed to solitary confinement at Bishop-Stortford. In self-justification, it seems, Pounde communicated Campion's paper to others, and in a short time it became public property. The Council now adopted more stringent measures.[1] All the suspected persons who were found "busier

[1] Bernardino de Mendoza writing to the King, 23rd July 1580, says: "All the Catholics in London and the whole of the country who have been released on bail or

in matters of State than was meet for the quiet of the realm, were imprisoned and made "to live at their own charges, some in Wisbeach, a place soon to become of shameful fam some in Banbury, or Framlingham, Kimbolton, Porchest Devizes, Melbourne, Halton, Wigmore, Durham, and oth places. When these prisoners who had hitherto been large were confined, letters were sent to the bishops orderi them to summon and commit the Catholics of their dioces The bishops were warned not to allow them "to come ma together at a time, lest they should know their own strength. But the chief Catholics were summoned up to London a committed, some as prisoners in their own houses, or in tho of their Protestant friends, or else were sent to one of t castles above mentioned. Allen, writing to the Cardinal of Co (12th September 1580), says: "The number of gentlemen n in prison is so great that they are obliged to remove the c prisoners for religion, the Bishop of Lincoln and several oth ecclesiastics, to other strange places far distant from the ci to make room for the new prisoners."[4]

Already were the old Marian priests justified in their fe of the result of the new mission.

In a letter written (17th November 1580)[5] after his retu to London, Parsons reports to the General the result of t expedition. After giving the number of officially notifi recusants at 50,000, he goes on, evidently forgetful of t

had given sureties to appear when summoned, have been ordered to surren themselves in the London prisons within twenty days, under pain of death"; and 21st August he further writes: "They have given the nobles who have hith presented themselves a month to make up their minds when they will choose, ei to hear the sermon or to stay in prison, where they are like to keep them during sitting of Parliament, to prevent them from opposing a Bill which they are determi to pass against the Catholics. This is to the effect that any Englishman who not openly attend the preachings should be punished by a fine of £40 sterling the first month, £80 for the second, and so on, doubling the fine for each mo This is Cecil's idea, who says that it is much safer for the Queen to deprive Catholics of their property than to take their lives" (*Calendar of Spanish S Papers* (Simancas), vol. iii. pp. 43 and 50).

[1] Burghley's *Execution of Justice*, p. 11.

[2] Lansdowne MS. No. 982, fol. 6.

[3] Harleian MS. 360, fol. 65.

[4] Theiner, *Annales*, iii. p. 215.

[5] Theiner ascribes this letter, under the date of September, to the Cardina Como.

July meeting in Southwark, to speak of his relations with the clergy. "The priests everywhere are in agreement with us (*consentientes*), nay, rather I ought to say humble followers (*obsequentes*), with the utmost testimony of love; and, in a word, there is among them all so high an estimation of the Society, that it makes us careful where we allow that we are Jesuits, especially as we are so far from that perfection which they venerate in us; so the more do we need the help of your prayer. . . . From dawn till late at night, after I have done my religious duties, and sometimes preaching twice on the same day, I am distracted with continual business. The chief are, answering questions of conscience, sending priests to suitable places, reconciling converts, writing letters to the wavering, helping prisoners with alms; for daily am I asked and do I beg. Then so many things remain to be done that I should lose heart under it, unless it was clear that all we do is to God's glory. The consolation of seeing the joy with which we are received in these provinces is greater than the labour of mind and body can be."[1] It will be noticed that already, within a few months of his arrival, Parsons is acting as superior over the Clergy, sending them hither and thither as he judged best. Also that they, on his report, received him with open arms, and were humble followers.

The expedition was successful; "though many slighted their wares and many defamed them, there were no few buyers and more admirers." There were converts made,[2] and Parsons had been able during these months to sound, by means of the confessional, the minds of many, and to discover what means would be necessary for carrying on both the spiritual as well as the political campaign to which he had now committed himself. He returned to London late in October, and in the letter of 17th November thus describes the situation: "The heat of the persecution now raging against Catholics throughout the whole realm is most fiery, such as has never been heard of since the conversion of England. . . . It is supposed that the reasons of this great persecution are: First, the ill-

[1] More, pp. 80 and 81.

[2] Lord Compton, Thomas Tresham, William Catesby, and Sir Robert Dymoke (in part) were some of Parsons' gains at this period.

success of the English in Ireland; next, the demonstratio made last summer against England by the Spanish Fleet; an lastly, the coming of the Jesuits into the island, and the grea number of conversions made by them, which has so astonishe the heretics that they know not what to do or say. They ar most troubled about a certain protestation of their faith an religion and of the reasons of their coming into Englan which the Jesuits wrote and signed with their names, an placed in the hands of a friend. . . . We, although all con versation with us is forbidden by proclamation, are yet mos earnestly invited everywhere; many take long journeys onl to speak to us, and put themselves and their fortunes entirel in our hands. It is therefore absolutely necessary that mor of our Society should be sent, if possible—not fewer than fiv —one Spaniard, one Italian, and three Englishmen, who mus be very learned men, on account of the many entangled case of conscience which arise from no one here having ampl faculties, and from the difficulty of consulting the Holy See which is treason."

"There is immense want of a bishop to consecrate for u the holy oils for baptism and extreme unction, for want o which we are brought to the greatest straits, and unless Hi Holiness makes haste to help us in this matter we shall be soo at our wits' end. . . . I keep myself safe here, in London, b frequent changes of place; I never remain more than two day in one spot, because of the strict searches made for me," etc. etc

It was at Uxbridge, at the house of William Griffiths that Parsons met Campion on his return from the country, an received his reports; and there it was their plans for th coming winter were arranged. While Parsons was to remai in and about London (for what purposes will soon appear Campion was to go northwards; and, as soon as he could write the defence of his Challenge, known afterwards as *Th Ten Reasons*. After mutual encouragement and renewin their vows, they parted. Parsons returned to London, findin his lodgings sometimes in Bridewell, sometimes in the sur rounding villages, and "sometimes even in one of the Queen palaces."[1] The Queen's marriage with Alençon was then th

[1] *Campion*, p. 257.

question of the day; and the Catholic cause seemed, in the eyes of those who looked to Spain for salvation, to be imperilled by the French interest. Parsons withdrew entirely from the party who favoured the match, and began to enter into relationship with the Spanish ambassador, Bernardino de Mendoza, and found a shelter in his house. The wily ambassador soon sounded the depths of Parsons' soul. They held frequent conversations together, and De Mendoza saw what a useful tool the Jesuit might become. By skilful handling he secured him, heart and soul, to the Spanish cause. The affairs of England, of Spain, and of Scotland,[1] which was now looked upon as the *point d'appui* for attacking England, were discussed; and with firm but gentle hand the ambassador brought Parsons round to such of his views as he chose to impart. It was here, too, that Parsons wrote the draft of the book against Elizabeth, which appeared under Cardinal Allen's name at the time of the Armada. It was perhaps written as the proof of his entire conversion to the Spanish cause.

At Uxbridge, Campion had recommended that a printing-press should be started, in order to bring out replies to the answers which they were sure to provoke. Aided by George Gilbert's purse, Parsons set up a complete printing and binding establishment under the direction of his friend, Stephen Brinkly, in a house called Green Street (East Ham in Essex), some five miles out of London; and got permission from the landlord for certain young gentlemen to lodge there. A difficulty soon arose from the parson of the place, who called upon the new arrivals to come to church. They were also on the brink of discovery through an incautious purchase of paper. "One day, a servant of Brinkly's was caught and racked; and although, as it turned out, no confessions could be extracted from him, yet at the news Parsons and Gilbert fled, but having no place to betake themselves to, they returned next day, having first sent Parsons' man, Alfield, to see that the road was clear. He did not return, and so their anxieties were redoubled, the more so as the man's father was a minister,

[1] Parsons had already been in communication with Mary Queen of Scots, who, in September 1580, had notified her wish that some Jesuits should be sent to Scotland to convert her son, then about fifteen.

and Parsons more than once had noticed the way in whic fidelity and faithlessness ran in families. So they once mo fled; but the next day Alfield returned, and was never afte wards thoroughly trusted by his master."[1]

The first book that came from this press was, *Son Reasons why Catholics should not go to Church*, — for th question had, under the new persecution, once more come u to the surface. As soon as this was printed, Brinkly too away the press. But that night Parsons got two publicatio against Campion's Challenge; one written by Clarke, fir preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and another by Hanmer. He w much perplexed. "They contained some most pestilenti accusations against him and Campion, and he saw no way refuting them. Brinkly offered to bring the press back if h would write an answer; but he had no place to put the pre in, and no books to refer to. Moreover, he went in continu fear of his man, Alfield, who wanted to go to Gloucester see his father. At last Francis Browne offered his hou (*at Henley*), his books, together with board and service. Parsons set himself to write the *Censure* of Clarke and Hanm in three parts . . . The *Censure* appeared, and the quickne of its repartee made the Government doubly angry. Parso thinks that the proclamation of 10th January 1581, orderi all young men to return from the seminaries, and denounci all receivers and favourers of priests and Jesuits, was a ki of reply to his *Censure*."[2] As we shall discuss such of Parso literary productions as are of permanent interest at the end this work, we will not stay to describe them here. Anot book produced at this time is the account of John Nicho who professed to be a Pope's scholar, and had turned former.

The persecution waxed hotter and hotter, and after t proclamation of 10th January, Parsons felt that some defin steps should be taken. He tried to get the Duke of Anjo agent to advise the Queen to more mildness; but he refu to meddle with the question. A meeting of Catholics w held one Sunday at the house of Francis Throgmorton, consider whether by offering the Queen a large sum of mo

[1] *Campion*, p. 261. [2] *Ibid.* p. 262.

they could not at least purchase toleration. But no one would propose it to her. It was the old story of belling the cat.

On Wednesday, 25th January 1581, a new Bill was brought into Parliament, which had been summoned for the express purpose of finding a remedy for the poison of the Jesuits.[1] Sir Walter Mildmay introduced the Bill, in which he described Parsons and Campion as "a sort of hypocrites, naming themselves Jesuits, a rabble of vagrant friars, whose principal errand was to creep into the houses of men of behaviour and reputation, to corrupt the realm into false doctrine, and under that pretence to stir up sedition." During the debates on this Bill, which received the Royal assent on 18th March, Parsons is spoken of as the "howling wolf," and Campion as the "wandering vagrant."

In the early part of 1581, other Jesuits, Holt, Creighton, and Heywood, were sent from Rome to help Parsons. They were at once destined for the work in Scotland, whither Parsons had in the preceding September sent one of the clergy, a Mr. William Watts, to prepare the way. Parsons and his party were then under the delusion that, if they could only get Mary out of prison and back to Scotland, the Catholics of that country would rise up, not only there, but also in England. Holt assured Tassis, the Spanish Ambassador at Paris, that he knew this to be a fact, for many of his penitents had told him so when he was treating with them on their consciences. But Philip, who knew of old that "the English hate the very name of foreigners; and (that) they wished the change to be made in a way that should not hand them over to any other nation,"[2] writes to Mendoza "that the best policy for the present was to gain souls by way of teaching, and thus to fortify the Catholic party for its time and occasion without precipitating matters through impatience." But he was to be careful not to throw cold water on the Scotch plan. "You will persevere in this course with due dissimulation."[3]

Parsons, as we have seen, took upon himself the practical superiority of the Clergy in England. The Society was to

[1] *D'Ewes' Journal*, p. 285.
[2] De Spes to King, 31st May 1569. *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. ii. p. 157.
[3] 6th March 1581. *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. p. 88.

have the glory of regaining England to the faith; the Clergy of England were to be the helpers only in the work—in plain words, the hewers of wood and drawers of water. The Jesuits had secured the seminary at Rome, and so could bring up a number of priests accustomed to their rule. But the seminary founded by Dr. Allen might prove a hindrance. Although at present he was more than friendly to the Society, who knew what the future might be, or what would be the views of his successor? To secure this other seminary in Allen's lifetime either directly, as at Rome, or indirectly by obtaining a control over it, would go far towards facilitating the design Parsons saw would be so much to the advantage of his plans. But how to do it, and how to get rid of Allen? Now is the time that we see the first steps in what—from the full course of events—we can have no hesitation in describing as a deliberate attempt on the part of Parsons to remove Allen. As soon as the Jesuit was established in the favour and house of Mendoza we find the first proposal made that Allen should be created cardinal: *Promoveatur ut amoveatur*, as the old saying is. On 6th April 1581 Mendoza writes to the King that "certain energetic gentlemen," looked up to as chiefs of the Catholics desire the King to notify how important it is "to prevent the vile weed of heresy from quite choking the good seed sown here by the seminarists, that an English cardinal should be appointed. There are two persons, Dr. Sanders, and William Allen who is in the seminary at Rheims, whose virtue and learning are such as to render them worthy of the dignity. . . The principal men amongst them are therefore very earnest about it; and I am assured a Catholic gentleman here has promised a thousand crowns a year to aid in maintaining some such personage."[1] To which the King, foreseeing advantages to his own policy, replies (28th May 1581): "I have ordered the Pope to be written to in recommendation of the persons of Sanders and William Allen." His secretary, Idiaquez, writes the same day: "I can assure you that we here are of opinion that not only one should be appointed, but that both the persons you name should be elected to the dignity, so that one might remain in Rome, and the other in Flanders or here. E

[1] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. p. 97.

this means the sympathies of the Pope might be retained by the man in Rome, whilst a more intimate understanding and intelligence might be kept up with the Catholics in England by the cardinal in Flanders. As we are uncertain whether the Sanders you mention is the same Sanders who is in Ireland," I shall be glad to be informed on that point, etc.[1]

In that early spring Parsons had a narrow escape of being captured. He thus tells the story: "While we were together in a house in a wood,[2] one night Hartley said to me casually that he had been at Oxford and had heard that Roland Jinks' servant, who had just before been employed by me at my house in London to bind some books, had gone over and had given evidence against his master. I at once saw the danger; and the first thing in the morning I went to London, and found that Wilkes, the secretary of the Queen's Guards, had that very night searched my chamber and carried off all he found there, and had apprehended Briant in a neighbouring house. Briant was my disciple and my pupil at Oxford, and ever inclined to virtue; afterwards he became a priest at Rheims of the greatest zeal. He reconciled my father,[3] and while he was in England he never willingly left my side." This capture gave great hopes to the Council that Parsons would soon fall into their hands; and torture was applied to Briant in the Tower (27th March) to make him disclose Parsons' hiding-place. But without effect. One thing was, however, clear. It would be wiser to withdraw from London, especially as the owner of the house at Green Street was getting suspicious. He had let his house, as he thought, to gentlemen; and, although Brinkly dressed up his seven workmen in fine clothes, and provided them with horses, there were signs of labour about the place. Parsons, therefore, moved the press to the "house in a wood," which was a lodge in Dame Cecilia Stonor's park near Henley. This new spot had two great advantages: it was sheltered by the thick trees from observation, and was easy of access by the river Thames. In the middle of May, Parsons recalled Campion to superintend

[1] *Ibid.*, vol. iii. pp. 118–9.

[2] Probably at Henley.

[3] Parsons' father died in 1579. In the scanty records we do not find any trace of a visit on Parsons' part to his family.

the printing of his book, *The Ten Reasons*, which was printe in this new house. On meeting, the two Jesuits spoke of th dangers surrounding them; and Parsons says: "We talke nearly a whole night on what we should do if we fell into thei hands, which really happened to him afterwards."

The way the books were distributed is thus described by letter to Agazzari in Rome, dated July 1581: "So much fo the books, which are as difficult and dangerous to publish a to print. The way is, all of them are taken to London befor any is published, and then they are distributed by fifties c hundreds by the priests, so that they may be published a together in all parts of the realm. And the next day, whe the pursuivants usually begin to search the Catholic house it is too late, for during the night the young gentlemen hav introduced copies into the houses, shops, and mansions of th heretics, and even into the Court, and the stalls in the street so the Catholics alone cannot be accused of possessing them These books were not sold. The cost of production wa partly borne by Gilbert, and the alms of the faithful did th rest. It was noticed, however, that the contributions for th prisoners began about this time to fall off, and complain were made that the alms were being diverted from the original destination to this new enterprise of printing.

In June 1581, the search becoming so near, and Georg Gilbert having become an object of suspicion to the Gover ment, Parsons, with the greatest difficulty, persuaded him leave England, and sent him to Rome with a letter of recor mendation to the Pope (dated London, 24th June 1581), which, after speaking of him in the highest terms, he say "He became so hateful to the heretics (especially as he ha once been one of them), that they searched for him everywher and threatened to put him to a cruel death if they could cat him. Now, although he cared little for this, yet since I sa that he could work no longer, nor stay in England witho plain peril of his life, and that we had more trouble an anxiety in protecting him than ourselves, I, at last, persuad him to leave all things and cross over the sea, to keep hims for happier times." On his way to Rheims, Gilbert called Allen, who sent letters by him to Agazzari (23rd June 158

in which he refers to the opposition against the seminaries which was being stirred by some Catholics. He calls them "the detractors of the colleges and mission who, to excuse their own idleness and cowardice, assert that all these attempts on our country are in vain." Then after expatiating upon the state of England, he speaks of Parsons: ". . . He preaches continually, he resolves cases of conscience. The Catholics in the midst of persecutions have less scrupulous consciences than anywhere else that I know of, and have such an opinion of the Father that they will not acquiesce in the judgment of any common priest unless it is confirmed by Father Robert. . . . He is continually appealed to by gentlemen and by some of the Council for necessary advice . . . it is supposed there are twenty thousand more Catholics this year than the last."[1]

Parsons hastened on the printing of Campion's book, and had four hundred copies ready for the Commencement at Oxford, 27th June. On that day those who entered St. Mary's Church to listen to the responsions of the students found copies of the book strewn on the benches. Campion's *Ten Reasons* are based on arguments which he derived from: (1) Holy Scripture; (2) the methods by which Protestants elude the force of the words; (3) the nature of the Church; (4) General Councils; (5) the Fathers; (6) the consent of the Fathers; (7) the history of the Church; (8) a collection of the most offensive sayings of the German reformers; (9) the weakness of the Protestant arguments; (10) a collection of various detached commonplaces. The book, written more in the style of a rhetorician than a theologian, ends up with an address to Elizabeth. "Listen, Elizabeth, mighty Queen. The prophet is speaking to thee, is teaching thee thy duty. I tell thee, one heaven cannot receive Calvin and these thy ancestors; join thyself therefore to them, be worthy of thy name, of thy genius, of thy learning, of thy fame, of thy fortune. Thus only do I conspire, thus only will I conspire against thee, whatever becomes of me, who am so often threatened with the gallows as a conspirator against thy life. Hail, then, good Cross! The day shall come,

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 149, No. 51.

Elizabeth, the day that will show thee clearly who loved thee the best, the Society of Jesus or the brood of Luther."

We must now turn our attention for a moment to Parsons' relations with Allen. Although Allen had gone in strongly for politics of late, yet he carefully kept distinct the two sides of his career. He never allowed his political plans to interfere with the spirit which reigned under him at Douai. There, he was the apostolical missioner, whose only care was to bring up priests to do simple, priestly work. He never sought in any way to influence his students politically. He had just written *An Apologie of the English Seminaries* (1581), and had been too pronounced in his assertions of loyalty to the Queen to please Parsons. Defending himself against the imputation of any knowledge of the first expedition under Sanders, Allen had written in this book: "The principal of that doth protest that he neither joined with rebel, nor traitor, nor any one or other against the Queen or realm, or traitorously fought or practised to irritate any prince or potentate to hostility against the same. Further invocating upon his soul that he never knew, saw, nor heard, during his abode in the Court there (*Rome*), of any such writings as are mentioned in the said proclamation of July, containing certain articles of confederation of the Pope, King of Spain, or other princes for the invasion of the realm; nor ever afterwards gave counsel to publish any such thing, though he were in Rome at the day of the date that some of those copies, which afterwards he saw when they were common to all the world, do bear."[1] And he had also written: "Therefore we do protest that neither the R. Fathers of the Society of the holy name of Jesus, whom the people call Jesuits (an express clause being in the instructions of their Mission into England that they deal not in matters of state, which is to be showed, signed with their late General's[2] hand of worthy memory), neither the priests, either of the seminaries or others having commission, direction, instruction, or insinuation from His Holiness or any other their superior, either in religion or of the college, to

[1] P. 15.

[2] Mercurianus died 1st August 1580; and Aquaviva was elected 19th February 1581.

move sedition; or to deal against the state or temporal government, but only by their priesthood and the functions thereof, to do such duties as be requisite for Christian men's souls, which consist in preaching, teaching, catechising, ministering the sacraments, and the like";[1] and he adds: "This is certain, that no such commission (*faculties*) . . . containeth or implieth directly or indirectly any commandment or conviction that the parties absolved should forsake their obedience in temporal causes to the Queen."[2]

All this was perfectly true in itself; but from Parsons' point of view, being now directly engaged in treasonable practices against the Queen, it was, to say the least, indiscreet. Allen must be got into the web of politics, and be thoroughly "hispaniolated," as the saying was. So in the midst of all the danger which beset him, the Jesuit calmly sat down and wrote (4th July 1581) a letter under the name of *Eusebius* to Allen.[3] He says the Catholics here asked him to beg Allen to write most urgently to the Pope to use his influence with the King of Spain to appoint Bernardino de Mendoza (who on account of his eyesight, and having incurred the hatred of the Council, was leaving England)[4] to Paris, or some near place where he could still look after the interests of the English Catholics. "For he is most skilled in English, French, and Scotch politics, and moreover knew, not only the state of affairs in England, but also understands in particular our men, their causes and conditions, and has carried himself so far with such prudence and trust, that there is no Catholic that would not yield their interest to him—a thing they would not do to another without long experience . . . Also, he knows me and the others of our Order better than anyone else, and holds to our method and order of action; hence, if he were at Paris without doubt he could be of wonderful help to us and our cause . . . the Catholics ask that you would help on this business by frequent and urgent letters to the purpose. I also ask you to satisfy their just desire, principally because it is the cause of God."

[1] P. 71. [2] P. 72.
[3] S. P. O. (*Roman Transcripts*), vol. i. p. 209.
[4] He was ejected by the Council.

There is no proof that this was the desire of the Catholics as a body. As the event will show, they were but a handful who desired to be sheltered under Spanish authority. It is a favourite device of Parsons to ignore the existence of any party opposed to his views, and to represent himself as the spokesman of "the Catholics" in general. A few days after writing this letter Parsons parted from Campion after mutual confession and renewal of vows. It was on Tuesday, 11th July; each one felt what neither liked to avow. They both knew it was the last time they should meet; so exchanging hats they bade one another farewell. Parsons went on to London, and Campion to the North, calling on his way at Lyford, a moated grange in Berkshire, where Mrs. Yates gave shelter to eight Bridgetine nuns.

Parsons made no long stay in London, but went down to Henley Park, the house of Francis Browne, brother of Viscount Montague, and there he heard that on Sunday, 16th July, his friend Campion had been taken, and was being led back to London in triumph. Parsons, who was only a quarter of a mile from the road Campion would pass by, wanted to go and see him. But this his friends would not allow, so he contented himself with sending his servant to see how the prisoner bore himself. We must now briefly narrate the fate of the gentle Campion.

He had gone off to Lyford, where there was no necessity for him to have gone at all, as two priests were always kept in that house. But the pious women there must needs see and hear the famous Jesuit. As Simpson says: "So fired are women's imagination, they must needs confess to Campion, receive his absolution and advice, and take the Communion from his hands. Campion himself, besides his natural courtesy, seems to have had a special liking for the kind of spiritual conference which he might expect at Lyford; and his impetuosity at last overcame the prudence of Parsons, who at first would by no means consent. The house was notorious, there would be great concourse thither when Campion was understood to be there; and this would be perilous for himself, and fatal to his expedition into Norfolk. 'I know,' said he, 'your easy temper; you are too soft to refuse anything

that is required of you. If you once get in there, you will never get away.' Campion said he would stay exactly as long as Parsons ordered him. Parsons asked him what security he would give for that. Campion offered Ralph Emerson as his bail; on which Parsons made Ralph Campion's superior on the journey and told Campion to obey him. Then, in the hearing of both, he told them not to tarry at Lyford more than one day or one night and morning; and bade Ralph take care that this command was executed."[1]

And so they went to Lyford, staying there but the one night and morning. But when Campion had got to Oxford on his journey, and was surrounded by a number of students and masters of the university, a message came begging him to return to Lyford, where there was assembled a large number of Catholics who were desirous of hearing him preach. After much persuasion, Ralph gave his permission, and Campion returned. For another two days he remained with the nuns; and on Sunday, 16th July, more than sixty assembled to hear his sermon. Just as he was preparing to say Mass, Eliot, one of the agents of Leicester, came to the house, and, under pretence of being a Catholic, succeeded in obtaining admission. Upon being informed that no less a person than Campion was there, he secretly sent off word to a neighbouring magistrate to come and apprehend the Jesuit. Soon after the Mass was over, alarm was given that the house was surrounded with armed men. Campion was hidden, and the company broke up in terror. Eliot, who had left immediately after Mass, now returned with a chosen band, and demanded admission. The search began; but the men engaged in it did not relish the work, and, laughing at Eliot, gave up the work after the whole afternoon had been spent. The magistrate withdrew, and was going to take away the rest of the men; but Eliot insisted, and at last they returned. The magistrate apologised to Mrs. Yates, and told her he was obliged to obey the Queen's mandate, but allowed her to choose a chamber in which she could pass the night unmolested by the searchers. She thereupon took possession of the room in which the priests were hidden, and had her

[1] *Campion*, p. 311.

bed made up there. When the searchers were wearied out with a fruitless quest, she sent them food and beer. Thinking they were all asleep, the infatuated woman insisted upon Campion coming out of his hiding-place and preaching one more sermon. The sentinels at her door heard the noise, and gave the alarm. Her room was searched, but no traces of the Jesuit could be found. At last on the Monday, through the inadvertence of a servant, Eliot found the hiding-place in a wall over the gateway. Bursting it in, he found Campion with two other priests, and they were at once committed to the care of Mr. Humphrey Forster of Aldermaston, the Sheriff of Berkshire. For three days Campion had to wait at Lyford in honourable custody until orders came from the Council. He was then taken under a strong guard to London. In passing Henley, Campion saw Parsons' servant, and made a sign of recognition. It was on Saturday, 22nd July, that Campion arrived in London. The town was crowded, it being market-day, and with all ignominy he was led through the streets. His elbows were tied behind him, and his legs fastened under the horse. On his hat was fastened a paper proclaiming him "*Campion, the seditious Jesuit.*" His fellow-prisoners, eleven in number, were treated in the same way. Arrived at the Tower, Campion was given over into the hands of Sir Owen Hopton, the Governor.

As we have said, the Government identified the priests who were pouring into England with the political measures of the Pope and King of Spain. And, moreover, the Queen was greatly exasperated with Rome, where an order was given that all English merchants going thither "on bargain to return (should) be apprehended, imprisoned, and executed as felons."[1] Thus, having Campion an emissary of Rome in their hands, they were determined to make an example of him. He was examined [25th July] in the presence of the Queen as to his motives for coming into England. She asked him if he acknowledged her as true Queen of England,[2] and upon his reply in the affirmative

[1] S. P. O. (*Italian Papers*), 23rd March 1582.

[2] But a few days later [1st August 1581] Campion being asked "whether he doeth at the present acknowledge Her Majesty to be a true and lawful Queen, or a pretensed

offered him life, honours, and riches if he would conform to the Anglican Church. He of course refused; but in order to shake the constancy of others, it was given out that he had recanted. Seeing his firmness, in spite of every offer, it was determined to force a confession from him by means of the rack. He suffered torture on several occasions.[1] He had offered to dispute,—and now he was taken at his word. But the disputations were a farce, and were only permitted with the object of discrediting him. Allowed no books, no warning, he was led into the chapel of the Tower on 31st August, where he found Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's, and Day of Windsor awaiting him with a large company. They were to attack, and Campion was only allowed to make such answers to their objections as he could. Suffering in every limb of his body, the poor Jesuit was not in a state to dispute; his memory was gone, and his mental powers almost extinguished. For two days of six hours each, the disputations went on; and although Campion made a brave fight, the result was a foregone conclusion. Another series took place in the middle of September, and again a third. When it was found these conferences did more harm than good, the Bishop of London asked Burghley to stop them.[2] Popular opinion, too, began to veer round in favour of the Jesuit; so it was determined to bring him to trial on the charge of high treason; and this was the more necessary as the Puritans were beginning to cause trouble at the proposed marriage of the Queen with the

Queen, and deprived and in possession of her crown only *de facto* . . . he saith that this question dependeth upon the fact of Pius quintus whereof he is not to judge, and therefore refuseth further to answer" (*A particular Declaration or Testimony of the undutiful and traitorous affection borne against Her Majesty by Edmund Campion, Jesuit, etc.* . . . Published by authority . . . 1582). According to this he refused to acknowledge Elizabeth as his Queen.

[1] "The clergymen they succeed in capturing are treated with a variety of terrible tortures; amongst others is one torment that people in Spain imagine to be that which will be worked by Anti-Christ as the most dreadfully cruel of them all. This is to drive iron spikes between the nails and the quick; and two clergymen in the Tower have been tortured in this way, one of them being Campion of the Company of Jesus, who with the other was recently captured. I am assured that when they would not confess under this torture, the nails of their fingers and toes were turned back; all of which they suffered with great patience and humility" (*De Mendoza to the King* (12th August 1581), *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. p. 153).

[2] Lansdowne MS. 33, art. 24.

EDMUND CAMPION, S.J.

1540 –1581

EXECUTED AT TYBURN, DEC. 1ST

From a print by Neefs

saint to guard. Eliot, the spy, visited him and begged his pardon, which Campion not only did not refuse, but urged him also to repentance.

There was a hope that the sentence would not be carried out; and it was supposed that the Duke of Anjou would intercede for his life. Alençon was approached upon the subject. He was engaged in a game of tennis when his chaplain came to him with the message. Pausing for a moment, he thought; and then suddenly crying out "Play," vouchsafed no answer, but went on with his game.

Friday, 1st December, was fixed for the execution. The day broke dismal and raining. Campion with Sherwin and Briant, the secular priests, were led out and tied on to the hurdles. Through the mud and slush of London they were dragged with a rabble of ministers and fanatics beside them. By Cheapside and Holborn, through the arch of Newgate, the drear procession went. The three priests, with faces lit up by the internal joy that filled their heart, actually laughed as they drew near to Tyburn. The people wondered and said, "They laugh, and do not care for death." The throng was thickest round about the gallows, and many Catholics were present to be eye-witnesses of the passing of the heroes. As the hurdles came to the foot of the tree, the rain ceased and the pale wintry sun shone forth. Campion was the first to suffer, and while saying that he prayed for his Queen, Elizabeth, and wished her a long, quiet reign with all prosperity, the cart was drawn away, and he meekly resigned his soul into the hands of his Maker. The sentence was carried out in all its barbarous details; but he was dead before the body was cut down. The other two priests met their fate in the same way.

Thus died Campion; and no one who is acquainted with his history will refuse to him the tribute of sincerity. Free from all ulterior design, and solely occupied in the spiritual work of gaining souls, if there was ever a martyr for his religious opinions it was Campion. But, unfortunately, he was allied with men who did, unknowingly to him, prostitute their high calling to political intrigues. It was they who fastened

round his neck the fatal cord, and gave the Government some grounds, at least, to suspect his complicity in treasonable attempts. His very death was used by his friends as a furtherance to their endeavours to subjugate England to a foreign Power; and while using other and unworthy means to bring about the conversion of England, took credit to themselves for Campion's apostolical spirit and steadfastness.

We must now return to Robert Parsons. When Campion was taken there was a hue and cry after the other Jesuit. He left Henley, as it was too near Stonor Park, where the printing press was; and fortunate it was he did so, for within a month it was discovered, and all the books and papers taken to London. Parsons went off to Mr. Shelley's at Michael Grove in Sussex; and there, early in the August probably, there came to him representatives of the old Marian Clergy and laity. What they had feared had come to pass. The Jesuits had brought more persecutions, and blood was about to be shed. While some urged Parsons to withdraw, in prudence, for awhile to the Continent, others plainly said, if he did not leave the country at once, they themselves would give him up to the Government as the cause, by his political practices, of all their undoing.[1] His friends advised it; his opponents forced it. So, bowing his head to the inevitable, he fled from England and made his way to Paris.

The flight of Parsons has often been brought up against him as a shameful desertion of what he considered the cause of God. Had he gone willingly or by the advice of friends it might have been so. But it was not a willing flight. He was driven out. Cowardice was no part of his character. For a whole year he had been living with his life in his hand. Of animal courage he had far more than the gentle, lovable Campion, whose natural shrinking from his fate was only sustained by religious motives. But to this one, the obedient Jesuit, the halo of martyrdom was granted; while to Parsons was reserved the less glorious rôle of a political intrigue. That Parsons felt deeply the insinuation on his flight is clear

[1] Dr. Ely's *Certaine Briefe Notes*; Bagshawe's *Answer to the Apology* p. 12.

from the heaps of excuses he piles up, all of which, it may be remarked, are to his credit.[1] But the real one is always left out. Parsons felt it bitterly.

[1] Parsons thus discusses his flight: "I returned into Sussex unto Michael Grove, and finding the commodity of passage to go to France, I resolved to go to confer with Mr. Dr. Allen, and Mr. Gilbert, and Fr. Claudius Matthews the Provincial, with full intention to return presently, though hitherto I have been letted. One cause was also to print some books which I had written in England, or was in writing, as the *Defence of the Censure*, the Latin *Epistle of Persecution*, and the *Book of Resolutions* in the first edition, all which were printed at Rouen this winter. Another cause of my coming over was to make a mission of Scotch fathers into Scotland, which by letters I had procured from the General; and Fr. Edward (Jasper) Heywood and Fr. William Creighton were appointed, but first to take directions from me." From the *Apologie* he adds: "He had a great consultation with himself and grave priests that were with him whether he should go over or no, for better disposing of a certain urgent business in hand, which he could not well do without his presence beyond the sea; but with the intention to return as soon as might be." He adds to the above excuse: setting up a printing-press in Rouen, conferring with Allen "about hastening the New Testament," starting a school, etc. "These then, and some other reasons we have understood . . . were the principal argument of that his journey." The reader, knowing the real reason of Parsons' flight, can fill up the omissions, and can understand the real significance of certain phrases in the above.

CHAPTER V

PLOTS AND SCHEMES

IMMEDIATELY upon leaving England Parsons acquainted th new General, Claude Aquaviva, of the fact; and also wrot a letter, dated 24th August, to Agazzari in Rome. In thi letter he says: "I think you already have known that, by th command of superiors, I have been for a time in this place o account of more convenience in doing some business, and als lest my presence, which is most hateful to my enemies, shoul be the cause of greater troubles to [my] friends."[1] A sho while after this date he left for Rouen, and thence wrote (26t September) a long letter to his General, in which he discusses th whole political situation.

Parsons had been intimate with Aquaviva, and found hi a character very like his own. Subtle, confident in his ow views, a ruler with strong ideas of military discipline, politician of the school which his enemies called Machiavellia Claude Aquaviva followed in the footsteps of Lainez. The two were the real founders of the Society, which, under the hands, departed from the original idea of Ignatius, a became in great part a political body. It was Aquavi who raised the Generalate to the extraordinary position gained in both Church and State; and under him the Society ro to its most brilliant height. He was not the man to thwa Parsons in plans for advancing the Society; his it would be encourage and help them on; and, as General, he had power dispense from every rule or constitution adverse to freedo of action. But while, on the one hand, Parsons was sure the feelings of his General, he hardly dared openly to disrega

[1] Theiner, iii. 474.

the formal prohibition not to deal in matters of State. Unless he got such a dispensation, of which there seems to be no record, it would appear that he took advantage of the doctrine of *epikeia*, and had already set up his own judgment in direct opposition to the explicit orders of those he professed to obey. We find on several occasions traces of economy in his dealings with his superiors.

It will be noticed in the following letter how careful Parsons is not to refer to the real cause of his leaving England, for this would at once destroy the belief of his influence with the English Catholics. And by withholding this now, as frequently he did by a similar want of openness, he led astray those in authority.

The letter, then, as given by More, is to the following effect. After mentioning as two of the reasons which took him over to France, to confer with Allen and to set up a printing-press, he goes on: "Thirdly, to speak with the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Queen of Scotland's ambassador at Paris, about aiding Scotland, whence the conversion of England chiefly depends; and to excite him by reasons and exhortation to fervent zeal in sending fit men to Scotland, especially at this time when, principally on account of the murder of Morton, and the character of the young Prince, there is no small hope apparent; also to tell him some secret plans of the heretics for the entire overthrow of Scotland, and the way in which they may be prevented. Fourthly, to find some means to excite the King of France to intercede with the Queen for the Catholics, at least for the alleviation of the very heavy fines which lately the law has imposed on those who refuse to go to the Protestant churches, a thing which all Catholics refuse. These were the chief things which brought me over here, the first three of which are by God's blessing well sped, to the great profit, I hope, of the cause. The last altogether hangs fire, for when the Nuncio, in the Pope's name, asked the King to write to the Queen on behalf of the afflicted Catholics of England, he answered he could not do it on account of certain secret matters of weight . . . I am now at Rouen, very busy, and await the return of my servant from England, where I sent him, as though I were in the North, with letters of consolation

to the Catholics. None of them know of my leaving,[1] nor do any in these parts, except Dr. Allen of Rheims, the Archbishop of Glasgow at Paris; and here, at Rouen, Michael de Monsi, nephew of the illustrious cardinal, and Archdeacon of Sens and Councillor of the Parliament of this city, a man certainly very zealous for the cause of God and of the Catholic faith. He is also exceeding well affectioned to our Society, and I use his purse and assistance in everything; for he has most freely and willingly placed himself and all he has at my disposal. To-day, two large bundles of letters have just come to me from England; and by these I learn (besides what I have said above) that I am greatly needed over there by the Catholics; hence I am obliged (*cogor*) to hasten my return; especially as Fathers Jasper (Heywood) and William (Holt), who have lately arrived, are not in London, but are occupied in other parts, where, they say, they are making abundant harvest of souls."

Speaking of the parts of England specially needing to be looked after, he says that at Cambridge "I have at length insinuated a certain priest into the very university, under the guise of a scholar or a gentleman commoner; and have procured him help from a place not far from the city; within a few months he has sent over to Rheims seven very fit youths."

Then, turning to Scotch affairs, he tells the General: "Now Scotland is our chief hope; for there depends not only the conversion of England, but also that of all the northern parts (of Europe); for the right of the English throne belongs (when she who now reigns is extinguished [2]) to the Queen of Scotland and her son, of whose conversion we have now great hope;[3] and it is important the chance should not be neglected. It is a pity the Scotch have not seen to this already. I have collected money and sent a priest with a servant into Scotland.

[1] This is hardly in accordance with facts. Though, perhaps, it may be taken to mean that the Catholics, as a body, did not yet know that he had been forced to retire.

[2] "*Extincta ista quæ nunc regnat*"—an ambiguous phrase.

[3] It is important, in view of Parsons' *Book of the Succession* and his after policy, to bear in mind this candid acknowledgment of the right of James VI. of Scotland to the English throne. Upon the question of the Jesuits' intrigues in Scotland, a subject which does not enter directly into the scope of this book, the reader may consult with advantage Mr. T. G. Law's *Documents illustrating Catholic Policy in the Reign of James VI.*, 1596–1598. Edinburgh, 1893.

bearing certain proposals either to the King, if he can get to him, or to the nobles. They are to this effect: that he should undertake the cause of the afflicted Catholics; being moved thereto by the question of his own security on the Scotch Throne; for his only chance of gaining the English Crown is by the help of Catholics; also, that thereby he would obtain the friendship of other princes, and would show his respect for his mother." James should also be made to remember that his father was slain by heretics, and his own life is exposed to the same danger. ". . . Now, I depend in all this business entirely upon your Reverence. First, whether I ought to follow up or not, that which all English Catholics most vehemently urge me beyond measure to proceed with; for on the conversion of Scotland depends all human hope of England's conversion; and if the King is once confirmed in heresy (which without doubt he is most dangerously infected with), no help or refuge will be left to the unhappy English; but if Scotland is open to them as a refuge, it will be a great consolation to them; at the present moment, access to the King is easy, and he is sufficiently flexible; afterwards it may be otherwise. Moreover, for avoiding cruel storms, it will be a very good thing for us to have some shelter in Scotland. Though there are some very fine Scotchmen (*in the Society*), all of whom we desire to send, yet they are few in number, and in no way sufficient for so great a vineyard, especially at this present moment, which seems to be the one time, these two years, for gaining Scotland, when they who govern are not much opposed to us, especially to outsiders. No laws are made against us, and we have the same idiom as the Scotch. I have arranged that Catholic books for the future should be sent to Scotland as well as to England; that is to say, books in the vulgar tongue on controversy as well as for devotion, of which there are so few in Scotland, as there is no press, and even the heretics have to send into England to get their books printed. This dearth of books causes Scotland to be much more inclined than England to heresy.

"If it seems well to your Paternity that I should continue this business, then besides the instructions I ask from you, it is necessary that the consideration of our necessity, at least for

some time, should be proposed to His Holiness. For this business cannot be carried on without money, as can be seen by former letters. The Scotch, besides being poor and in great want, have not, up to the present, that zeal for the Catholic cause to be willing to stand the expense. They think they are doing a good deal for the cause if they provide horses for us, and bestow on us some kind of protection. On the other hand, English Catholics are so exhausted that they cannot help themselves or their imprisoned relatives, who are many, and in a sad plight. I have spent for these affairs more than a thousand crowns given by them.[1] Nevertheless, since I know His Holiness is overburdened with many expenses it greatly grieves me to ask anything from him; but if his kindness will grant us four hundred crowns a year for two or three years, I can do a great deal in this business towards the consolation of His Holiness and the benefit of the Christian Commonwealth." He then insists on the difficulties and importance of the case. He must have the money paid quarterly, and will expect the first payment to be made before Christmas; and suggests that the Pope might as well make this first payment two hundred instead of one hundred crowns. The Scotch have asked the General to send them some Italian Jesuit; but Parsons shakes his head, and tells Aquaviva it will be better to send no one at all than to send one unfit, "for it will do much harm to the whole cause, and especially to the good repute of the Society." He then discusses who should and who should not be sent.

He informs the General that a regular means of communicating with England and Scotland has been established by means of two clever young tradesmen, who give out that they are servants of some great merchant, and are thus able to go and return with liberty and safety. "I have to-day received other letters from England, which tell me I am greatly wanted there, especially to provide alms for those in prison; some of the more influential and prudent urge that before I return to the dangers of England I should undertake the Scotch

[1] It was a constant complaint that the collections made throughout England for the seminaries at Rheims and for Catholic prisoners in England were diverted by Parsons for the Quixotic Plan of Campaign in Scotland.

affair, by letters, and by Father Jasper [Heywood]. Father Jasper last week came from the provinces, where he was at work, to London with an abundant alms for those in prison, and at the same time writes to me saying that he is in high favour among the nobility of his district, that Fr. William [Holt] has been ill just after his arrival, but was now well, and hard at work. They also write about an Italian, whom it is proposed to send as Italian tutor to the King. If such an one be sent, let him come to the house of the Archdeacon at Rouen, where he will find everything ready for him, and will get accurate directions from me; but he should avoid Paris or Rheims, on account of suspicion.[1] Let him write to me under the name of Mr. Rowland Cabel, merchant."[2]

This letter throws a singularly clear light on Parsons' character. He gives the impression that he is greatly missed in England, and is wanted for most important affairs; but he also takes care to answer, indirectly, any reasons that might make the General ask, "Why, then, don't you go back at once?" He adroitly dangles before Aquaviva's eyes the Scotch affair, and by side-hints implies how important it is that he should remain in France to manage this business; or, if he must return to the Mission, the more influential and prudent of his correspondents advise that he should be the one to go to Scotland. He covers the omission of the real reason which drove him out of England by mentioning some "as the chief things," though not as the only things; and in no place in this remarkable letter does he express any desire to return to England, in spite of the urgent necessity he reports. This letter has its effect; from henceforth, whilst retaining his position as superior, Parsons is no longer the missioner, but the politician.

From this letter, also, we gather that as soon as he arrived in Paris, he saw the Archbishop of Glasgow, and had an interview with Allen. He had given the latter three hundred pounds towards the expenses of providing the version of the New Testament known as the Rheims Testament, which was

[1] Perhaps, also, to avoid Allen or the Archbishop of Glasgow interfering in this business.

[2] More, *Historia*, pp. 113–121.

then in the press. He then went to Rouen, where he was some time before the 26th of September, and at once set about procuring a printing-press and starting an establishment of his own, the first product of which was a *Letter of Consolation to the afflicted Catholics of England.* That same winter appeared the *Book of Resolution*, a treatise designed to help men on to resolve to serve God. He got the idea from a book of Loartes, which Brinkley had translated in 1579. This *Book of Resolution* was afterwards entirely recast and enlarged, under the name of *The Christian Directory*, and, it is said, met with much success.

But the grand work that was occupying all his attention was the Scotch affair. He kept up a close correspondence with Mendoza on the subject. "Mary had also written most urgent letters to the Duke of Guise, to beg him to intercede with the Nuncio and the Provincial of the Jesuits, that some Scotch fathers might be sent into Scotland without delay. To Don Bernardino de Mendoza she wrote that Parsons was at Rouen, and that he must be made to feel that it was no time to spend in writing books when the salvation of kingdoms was at stake."[1]

Already had the ambassador in London written (20th October 1581) to his sovereign on the subject in the following terms: "As soon as this clergyman (Watts) returned, the result of his mission was conveyed to William Allen in France, and Father Parsons of the Company of Jesus, who was secretly here.[2] The latter went to France for a few days to choose the persons to be sent to Scotland; although the clergyman who went was of opinion that Parsons himself and Fr. Jasper of the Company, who recently came hither through Germany, would be the best persons to go, as it was necessary that they should be very learned to preach and dispute, as well as of signal virtue. Fr. Jasper came many miles to see me here (London), and obtain my opinion on the point. After having discussed the matter minutely, we have resolved to write to Allen saying, that although Frs. Parsons and Jasper would be the best and most able persons to be sent to cure the important limb of Scotland, yet we should not deprive the brain

[1] Morris, *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, vol. ii. p. 17.

[2] Parsons, it will be remembered, had found a shelter in Mendoza's house.

of its principal support, which we should do if these two men were both to leave here, where their presence is so necessary to govern and distribute the priests [1] which are in this country, as well as for conducting matters of religion which are cropping up every day, and helping the Catholics in many ways. Besides this, no sooner will these men set foot in Scotland than this Queen will be informed thereof, and their description sent hither, so that neither of them could ever return to England again, except with great peril and probable martyrdom. For these reasons, it will be well that Jasper with two other learned clergymen should go to Scotland with some others in their train, while Parsons should remain here until His Holiness was informed, and he had appointed proper persons for the ministry. By this means the priests in England would not be deprived of their superior, it being difficult and dangerous for people in his position to enter the country unknown." [2]

Less than two months after (11th December), he writes again: "Jasper has been ill with sciatica, and Parsons has been declared a rebel by the Queen, and this has caused us to change the plan, as Parsons cannot return to this country without great risk, although he was already waiting to embark; and if he were here he would now be unable to do anything, since any person who shelters or converses with him is liable to punishment for high treason. We have therefore decided that Jasper shall remain here (London), as God endows him with grace to win many souls, while Parsons should go to Scotland [3] direct from France, where he now is, with five or six priests which may be selected." [4]

Philip was pleased with the first proposal, and authorised a credit of two thousand crowns to be sent for their expenses. But Parsons never went to Scotland; Father William Creighton took his place.

[1] These words are worth noticing, together with the assertion at the end of the extract that Parsons was acting "their superior."

[2] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. pp. 195–6.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 236.

[4] Morris says: "Fr. Parsons was so moved when he received this message (from the Queen of Scots) through Dr. Allen, that he was on the point of leaving everything and starting for Scotland" (p. 17).

About this time Parsons came into contact with the Duke of Guise, who, by right of his wife, had possession of the town of Eu, near Rouen, and frequently lived there. The French Provincial, Fr. Claude Mathew, was his confidential adviser, and through him, doubtless, Parsons came to know the Duke. Since the year 1578, Guise had been seeking to deliver Mary Queen of Scots, and had proposed to the Spanish Ambassador a scheme for doing so by the united armies of France and Spain. But as the French King, on account of the proposed marriage of Elizabeth with D'Alençon, refused to interfere, Mary wrote to Guise (February 1580), charging him "to place herself, her son, and her kingdom, without reserve, in the hands and under the protection of his Catholic Majesty, that he may order everything according to his will, and as should seem good to him, and if it so pleased him, even causing her son to be taken to Spain and marrying him there, and disposing of her and of him at his good will."[1]

From the Duke of Guise Parsons obtained leave to establish a house at Eu, which the French Jesuits had placed at his disposal for the purpose of founding a school for English boys; and the munificent benefactor bestowed, for six years, an annual income of four hundred Italian crowns on the new establishment. Parsons placed this new house under the direction of a secular priest, a Mr. Mann, otherwise Chambers.

Creighton seems in his enthusiasm to have made promises of help from the Pope[2] which were unreliable, and proposals which upset all the plans of Mendoza. Mary had no reliance

[1] Teulet, *Relations politiques de la France et de l'Espagne*, vol. v. p. 206.

[2] Mendoza writing to the King (26th April) tells him what this promise was: "Creighton promised: in the name of the Pope and your Majesty, to the Duke of Lennox, fifteen thousand men for the war in Scotland. He has no grounds whatever for this, as is pointed out clearly by the Queen of Scotland, who says she does not know the origin of the promise, which I have no doubt the good man has made entirely on his own initiative, in the belief that, as in May last year, when he was in Rome His Holiness told him he would assist with the necessary number of men, he might promise the round number, etc. . . . They, the priests, although ardently zealous as regards religion, cannot be trusted with matters of State unless they be taught word for word what they had to say. . . . I have also written to Dr. Allen and Father Parsons in France, requesting Parsons to leave for Ireland (Scotland) immediately, as we had agreed, with the money I had sent him for the purpose, etc." (*S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. No. 255).

in these Jesuits. In their simplicity they suggested that Mendoza should leave his post in England and go over to Rouen to talk over matters with Parsons. On hearing this, Mary wrote to the ambassador (6th and 8th April): "The request sent to you by those Jesuits that you will go over and see them at Rouen, will prove to you how far their experience in matters of state is from corresponding with their zeal in religion;[1] and it will be necessary to keep them well and frequently instructed as to how they are to conduct themselves in all that concerns state affairs; for these good people may blunder seriously unless they have wise counsel and advice. You may judge of this by the proposal they make to me to send Lord Seton's two sons as commissioners in the form of ambassadors, both of them being so young, and quite inexperienced in matters of such importance as this. It is quite out of the question that they could be entrusted with such a negociation in which, if they were discovered, my own life, and the whole future of my son, would be imperilled. Beside this, it is my intention that these negociations shall be conducted in such a way that they shall never be discovered that they were undertaken with my authority; but if it should be necessary for me to intervene, I have already very much more fitting means of doing so than this. You may therefore inform these Jesuits that I will on no account allow that anything concerning this matter shall be done in my name or with my authority, unless necessity should demand it. For this reason I do not approve of sending anyone on my behalf to negociate with His Holiness and the King of Spain, your master, especially before I am assured of their co-operation."[2] But Parsons thought otherwise, and Creighton was recalled.

In the April of the following year (1582), Creighton returned from his expedition to Scotland, and went to Rouen to Parsons, who thus carries on the narrative in his *Autobiographical Notes*. He "brought answer from the Duke of Lennox, then governor of Scotland and of the young King,

[1] This proposal amused Philip, who says to Mendoza (6th May): "As you say, they show their simplicity in asking you to leave England to see them; but you manage the matter excellently, as you do all things" (*S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. p. 359).

[2] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. pp. 330–1.

to the full contentment of the Duke of Guise (with whom we had conferred before at his house at Eu in Normandy about the advancement of the Catholic cause in both realms of England and Scotland, and for the delivery of the Queen of Scots, then a prisoner), and therefore we, repairing to him again to give him the answer, he first gave me a hundred pounds a year for a seminary of English youths at Eu, and the fathers gave me a house for them. . . . After this was established he went to Paris with us; and calling thither Dr. Allen and Fr. Claude Mathew, he counselled with the Pope's Nuncius, the Archbishop of Glasgow, and the Spanish Ambassador." William Holt had also arrived from England to back up Parsons by testifying to the desires of the English Catholics. The meeting at Paris must have been some time after 8th May; for on that date the Nuncio writes to the Cardinal of Como: "Nothing further can be done just now owing to the illness of Father Robert, a Jesuit who has arrived from England, where he has had this affair in hand for the last two years, and has in his mind all that should be done, and will come thither from Rouen, where he has been suffering from fever these three days past."[1] The subsequent consultation caused an alteration in their plans. This somewhat displeased Mendoza, who writes from London (15th May 1582) to the King: "The priests who must act in unison with others in France are conducting matters differently from what the Queen of Scotland and I desire. In addition to the absurd promise given by Fr. Creighton to the Duke of Lennox, they have again changed the order that I had given them to remain in Scotland, and that Fr. Parsons should go thither to strive, by preaching and reading, to convert the King; and Fathers Creighton and Holt arrived in France on the 14th ult. They detained Parsons, who was on the road; and, after having communicated their mission to the Bishop of Glasgow, the Queen of Scotland's Ambassador, they had an interview with the Duke of Guise. At this interview there were also present the said ambassador, Creighton, Fr. Robert (Holt?), Dr. Allen, and Parsons. Creighton made a statement as to the condition of Scotland, and said how ready the

[1] S. P. O. (*Roman Transcripts*), vol. v. fol. 472.

people were for conversion. He then proceeded to say that the Duke of Lennox was resolved to convert the people and the King himself, if your Majesty and the Pope would aid him with eight thousand foreign troops, paid for six or eight months, and with sufficient arms of all sorts to supply as many more Scotchmen. With this force, after the conversion which would immediately follow the landing, the King would march upon England, where they would be joined by the English Catholics, and would release his mother, reducing England to submission to the Apostolic See. . . . He begged that this force might be sent in the month of September, or October at the latest, as otherwise he was resolved to leave Scotland, taking the King and the Catholics with him. . . . Guise urged that in order to report this to your Majesty and to His Holiness, Father Robert Parsons should carry letters from Lennox to your Majesty, whilst Creighton took similar ones to the Pope, both of them taking also letters and instructions from Guise. He offered, immediately the foreign troops landed in Scotland, to bring over four thousand to the county of Sussex, to divert the heretics. . . . This is reported to me by Dr. Allen and the rest of them, who ask me to convey it to your Majesty immediately, and to send a letter, so that Parsons may start at once and be duly recognised on his arrival. I send him the letter, and another for the minister at Rome; and in view of your Majesty's last instruction I think it necessary to send this by special courier, in order that your Majesty and the Pope may take steps to prevent the Scotch business from being precipitated and the conversion of the countries thus rendered impossible. . . . I understand that Parsons is to be accompanied by William Tresham, who left this country under suspicion of being a Catholic. He is the person through whom I have been from the first in communication on these matters, with his brother Lord Thomas Tresham; and for this reason he is well deserving of some favour from your Majesty."[1]

After the consultation in Paris, where we see it was arranged that Parsons was to go to Spain, he drew up for the Nuncio a memorandum upon the state of English affairs, and

[1] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. pp. 362–4.

it was forwarded (22nd May) to the Cardinal of Como. This, as far as we know, his first state document, is worthy of notice, for he writes to convey to the Holy See the entirely false impression that the Catholics of England were united, and that he was only the exponent of their wishes, and speaks in their name; also that the priests at work on the mission field would be, at the proper time, the channels of political movement. But beyond this is seen Parsons' intention of removing Allen from the direction of the seminary. In accordance with his former advice, Gregory XIII., at the proposal of Spain, had offered to make Allen a cardinal, an honour he was unwilling to accept. Now, he was to be made Bishop of Durham. And Dr. Owen Lewis was also to be moved from Rome, as he was the centre of the opposition there to the plan of Jesuit supremacy in English affairs. It will also be remarked that Parsons claims to be then engaged upon writing the books which afterwards, at the time of the Armada, came out under the honourable name of Cardinal Allen. The following is the important part of this document:—

"It is necessary to the enterprise to appoint secretly a Bishop of Durham. For the Bishop of Durham is a personage of the greatest importance, both on account of the number of people who will follow him, and also for the purpose of controlling and reconciling differences between the other gentlemen of these parts. Hence, it is requisite that this bishopric be given to a man of credit and repute unto the people of that part of England. But there is no one of this kind to be found at present among the English except Dr. Allen, president of His Holiness's seminary at Rheims, a man whose authority and reputation stands so high with the whole nation, that his mere presence, even as a private individual, will have a greater effect with the English than several thousand soldiers, and not only the Earl of Westmorland, who is very difficult to manage, but all the other banished gentlemen, bear him such reverence that at a word of his they would do anything; much more if he were in some post of dignity or prelacy with them. I say all this that your Lordship may know the disposition of the English at the present time, both within and without the realm, who all repose the greatest confidence in Allen, and will receive

whatever he tells them as most agreeable, and admitting no debate. Hence, in all these affairs, it is necessary that he should take part. There are many other bishoprics in England richer and greater than this bishopric of Durham; but on account of its convenient position near the frontier, and the authority and royal jurisdiction which it possesses in these parts, even in temporal things, it alone is of more importance in this affair than many other bishoprics together. It will be necessary that Dr. Allen be speedily apprised of the intention of His Holiness, that he may dispose of certain persons, so as to have them in readiness against that time; and that he may also write and print secretly certain books which we are writing at this moment, with the view of satisfying the people of England; and again, may make many other necessary preparations, both as regards himself, for it is most essential that he be there in person, otherwise the affairs in England will not go well in my opinion; and in respect to other gentlemen, whom he must find means, as he will do, of sending secretly in disguise to Scotland. Moreover, at the proper time the principal Catholics will receive information of the affair by means of the priests. But this will not be done until just before the commencement of the enterprise, for fear of its becoming known; since the soul of its affair is its secrecy. It would also, as we think, be very useful if His Holiness were to summon to Rome Dr. Owen Lewis, Archdeacon of Cambrai, an Englishman who is at Milan, and is very well acquainted with English affairs. If this man were sent from Rome to Spain under some other pretext, and so went thence with the army to Scotland to meet Allen, who might start from here, it would be a great help to the cause; for though this Dr. Owen, on account of the differences which have lately arisen between the Welsh and English, he being a Welshman, does not stand very well with the greater part of the English, nevertheless as he is a grave and prudent man, if united to Allen, who possesses the hearts of all, he would be of no small assistance, especially with his countrymen, the Welsh, who can be of much service in this affair, and will desire to help, from the great affection which they bear to the Catholic faith; and when the army has reached England, then Dr. Owen might be sent to

Wales with the great lords of that country who already favour us, to help in raising the people of those parts. The importance of this affair rests entirely on the secrecy and rapidity observed; for, if the expedition be not sent immediately, there is no hope of the opportunity continuing, nor will it be ready to hand in the future; whereas, if seized now, there is no doubt but that by God's grace the result we desire will be effected, for all things are already most fully disposed for it. There is another thing I should remind your most reverend Lordship as of the greatest importance. It is, that owing to there being great points in dispute, and natural rivalry hitherto between the Scotch and English nations, which, if revived (as we hope they will not be), would cause many hindrances, it will be necessary to provide that in regard to the things or concessions (?) which should come from His Holiness, the two nations shall be placed on an equal footing. This will be effected if the English see that Dr. Allen, or some other Englishman like him (though the English have at present no other head to whom to trust themselves except Allen only), is joined on behalf of England with the Archbishop of Glasgow on behalf of Scotland, in those points which concern the state of both the kingdoms at once. Lastly, I have to offer to your Lordship, in the name of all the Catholics of England, their life, their goods, and all that lies within their power for the service of God, and His Holiness, in this enterprise, which they desire so earnestly that they promise if our Lord God shall give them the victory (and beg your Lordship also to promise in their name), most honourable consideration to all those who shall aid the affair, or labour in it, or do anything to favour or forward this enterprise."[1]

A few days after this document was drawn up, Parsons, under the *alias* of Richard Melino, left Paris for Spain. De Tassis, the Spanish Ambassador writes (29th May) to the King:

"The priests have left—the Scotsman for Rome going a few days ago, and the Englishman (*Parsons*) for Spain, yesterday. The latter is so ardent, and confident in favour of the proposal, so far as regards England, that encouragement must be given to a man so full of divine zeal for the restoration

[1] S. P. O. (*Roman Transcripts*), vol. xv. No. 477.

of religion, and of our own in Flanders. . . . They (Parsons and his friends) are moderate in their demands, and are not in favour of Hercules' (*Guise*) plan to effect everything by the hands of His Holiness alone, which they do not think feasible. They say it will be advisable that his name alone should be publicly employed, but that he should provide the money, and the enterprise be secretly managed by your Majesty. They think that under the present circumstances all the men and ships necessary might be collected in Portugal without arousing suspicion, and the navigation could be conveniently undertaken from there, etc."[1]

Parsons, then, on 28th May[2] set out on a long journey to Spain. In the burning summer heat he passed over the arid plains of the north of Spain, intent upon his project. The King had tried to stop him coming, but his letter was too late. Never "a good goer on foot," as he says, Parsons must have travelled quickly on horseback over the Pyrenees, and through Spain into Portugal; for we find him arrived at Lisbon—according to his own statement—on 15th June.

"This summer was spent in Lisbon, when the Marquise of Sancta Crux went to the Terceras, and had his victory against the French and Pietro Strozza. And in the mean space, the Queen of England, mistrusting the Duke of Lennox for that he was Catholicly given, caused him to be taken by a sleight of hunting in Scotland[3] and the King to be taken from him, himself to go to France by England, where he was poisoned, as it is supposed, for that he died as soon as he arrived in Paris; and so fell all that attempt to the ground."

When Parsons had audience of Philip, skilful and wary politician, he was received with great show of kindness and carefully worded replies. But it was not long before the King found the Jesuit a soul akin, and at this journey was laid the foundation of the intimate intercourse which existed between them unbroken till Philip's death. On this occasion, though he could not get the armed force for Scotland he came to seek,

[1] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. pp. 378–9.

[2] Parsons in his *Autobiographical Notes*, written late in life and from memory says they left Paris 1st May. But the above letter is explicit.

[3] August 1582.

he procured a present for James of twenty-four thousand crowns. He also took the opportunity of introducing again the subject of Dr. Allen's cardinalate, which the King promised to promote. Furthermore, at his request, a pension of two thousand ducats was fixed on the seminary at Rheims. These two arrangements coming together go to confirm the opinion we have already given of Parsons' views towards that seminary and its Rector.

When the news of the capture of the Duke of Lennox arrived at Lisbon, the King evidently thought wisdom was justified in her children; so, consoling Parsons with his gift to James, he bade him farewell.

"I returned with Mr. William Tresham about Michaelmas and coming to Bilbao I fell sick very grievously, and so stayed all that winter in Bascay, and the next spring returned to France." Parsons was never strong. As we have seen, the consultation in Paris had been delayed on account of frequent attacks, which were most likely the remains of Roman malaria. Throughout the rest of his life he suffered a great deal from aguish attacks. On this occasion he was seriously ill; and Father Gonzales, the Provincial of Castile, hearing of his state caused him to be taken to the College of Oñate, where he was nursed by his Spanish brethren. Allen, having heard nothing of him for two months, concluded he was dead, and wrote to Agazzari (29th December) in Rome to find out the news. There was a true friendship between these two men; and at that time Allen seems to have entered heartily, as far as he knew them, into all Parsons' political schemes. If, later on, Allen changed his opinions, he never, it would seem, changed his personal regard for the Jesuit. Parsons had one of those magnetic personalities which either attract greatly or repel as violently; and throughout his eventful life we find him surrounded with devoted friends and bitterly opposed enemies.

Perhaps during this journey to Spain Parsons came first in contact with the spirit of dissatisfaction which in a few years was to burst out into open rebellion among the Spanish Jesuits. The new General, Aquaviva, had strong views on the subject of government. He was determined to consolidate once for all what his predecessors had aimed at. He believed

that men who boasted of their obedience must learn to obey. Already in the July of 1581 had he sent out his letter to the Provincials on the happy increase of the Society, and had pointed out that for the appointment of superiors it was not enough to choose the most worthy, but the man, most habile and endowed with such qualities of ruling, as came up to the Jesuit idea. The results of this measure, and the dislike to political meddling, joined with the fact that the General was an Italian, caused much bitter feeling in Spain. But this disaffection not only had no influence over Parsons, it even tended to throw him more and more in practice back upon the Rock of Shelter he had found for himself in the shape of authority. There was another miasma in the air, and, unless I am mistaken, it was probably at this visit that it first attacked Parsons. The Spanish theological mind was of a highly speculative character.[1] It enunciated principles of theology which, when reduced by a logical application to practice, shocked and alarmed the world. Such doctrines as were afterwards openly advocated by Mariana in his king-killing doctrines, by Escobar in his teaching upon Equivocation, and the doctrine, for which Caramuel[2] quotes Hurtado and other Spanish Jesuits, that "It is a probable opinion that it is no mortal sin to bring a false accusation for the sake of preserving our honour," were, it is probable, being discussed. It is unnecessary to say that these and similar doctrines were condemned. Such like speculations seem to have found entrance into Parsons' naturally subtle mind, and were afterwards to bear fruit which caused scandal and grief to all good men.

With the returning spring Parsons sufficiently regained his health to return. He set out from Madrid on the last day of April 1583; and, says the Nuncio to the Cardinal of Como, "he left the Catholic King exceedingly well disposed towards the enterprise of England and Scotland, and his Majesty is of opinion that it ought by all means to be carried out this year."[3]

[1] Suarez, for instance, devotes a whole volume of over a thousand pages to speculations about the Angels.

[2] *Theologia Fundamentalis*, lib. ii. p. 809.

[3] S. P. O. (*Roman Transcripts*), vol. xvii. p. 165.

He arrived in Paris in eight days, and took up his residence at St. Cloud with De Tassis. He found awaiting him some troublesome reports from England about Father Heywood.[1] He therefore wrote and required explanations, which Heywood sent by a secular priest—John Curry—who was on his way to join the Jesuit novitiate.

These were domestic troubles. Parsons had now to face opposition from such of the exiles who viewed, not only with hesitation, but downright disapproval, the sight of ministers of a kingdom that is not of this world dabbling in politics, to the certain disgrace of their cause. We have seen that in England there was a strong party against Parsons' action—so strong as to force him to leave the country. In France, he had to face a similar resistance, which may not perhaps have had as pure a motive at the beginning. At Paris were two men whose names figure frequently in the despatches of the day. And one of them at least, Charles Paget (fourth son of William Lord Paget), in his own interest kept up a correspondence with Walsingham, and disclosed the traitorous designs that were in progress. The other was Thomas Morgan—"of a right honourable family in Monmouthshire." These two, at the request of the Queen of Scots, had joined James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, her ambassador, as secretaries. They and others represented the Scotch interest as opposed to the Spanish, and were therefore so far opposed to Mary's desire. Parsons details these quarrels in his *Autobiographical Notes*, which, it must be borne in mind, were begun at Rome 8th May 1601. And on this very point Manareus, the Jesuit Provincial (Flanders) wrote (18th September 1597) to Daras, one of the assistants, that in these accounts "Fr. Parsons may very easily have erred in great part of his story on account of his old prejudice."[2] Parsons says:

"Mr. Paget came from England, and to have brought contrary answer to that which was expected by the Duke and procured by him, which the priest, Mr. Watts, that had been

[1] "Bartoli says that in spite of Heywood's previous reputation and of his acknowledged piety and his sufferings for religion, a character for an obstinate adherence to his own opinion rendered it impossible for him to be employed in any capacity but that of a simple *operarius*" (Morris's *Life of Father William Weston*, p. 72).

[2] *Tierney*, iii. p. xcv.

(in) Scotland . . . declared to the Duke and to Fr. Claudius and to me that it was procured of set purpose by Mr. Paget, as he told Mr. Watts before his departure that he would . . . (and) that he coming into England would, in a few days, dissolve all that had been treated therein by Jesuits; and so it ensued."

Parsons alleges that the cause of Paget's and Morgan's opposition was that they were not invited to take part in the conference held in 1582 at Paris. But Paget says it was from the distaste he had to seeing affairs of state, which ought to be managed by gentlemen, undertaken by priests. Whatever the original cause was, these men became the centre of the anti-Jesuit party; that is to say, of Catholics who, without adopting all Paget's ideas and ways, joined him in so far as they were loyal to their country as well as to their consciences.

It must be remembered that the political party, with which Parsons was intimately engaged with, were at this very time occupied in a deliberate conspiracy to kill Elizabeth. A Catholic bishop (the Nuncio) does not hesitate to write to a cardinal, the Pope's own nephew, a full and detailed account of the plot. And this without one word of condemnation, but only with the advice that it should not be made known to the Pope. What he wrote (2nd May 1583) was as follows:—

"The Duke of Guise and the Duke of Alençon (Mayence) have told me that they have a plan for killing the Queen of England, by the hand of a Catholic—though not one outwardly—who is near her person, and is ill-affected towards her, for having put to death some of his Catholic relations. This man, it seems, sent word of this to the Queen of Scotland, but she refused to attend to it.[1] He was, however, sent hither, and they have agreed to give him—if he escapes—or else his sons, 100,000 crowns, as to which he is satisfied to have the security of the Duke of Guise for 50,000, and to see the rest deposited with the Archbishop of Glasgow in a box of which he will keep the key, so that he—or his sons—may receive the money, should the plan succeed; and the Duke thinks it may. The Duke asks for no assistance from our Lord in this affair, but when the time comes he will go to a place of his near the

[1] Compare with Parsons' account, 30th June 1597, to be given later on.

sea to await the event, and then cross over on a sudden into England. As to putting to death that wicked woman, I said to him that I will not write about it to our Lord the Pope (nor do I), nor tell your most illustrious Lordship to inform him of it; because, though I know our Lord the Pope would be glad that God should punish in any way whatever that enemy of His, still it would be unfitting that His Vicar should procure it by these means."[1]

It was against this party of blood that Paget made a stand.

Parsons, hearing of Paget's opposition, left Paris soon after his arrival and went to Rouen, where Paget still was, and sought all means to regain him, and then returned with him to Paris, and summoned Allen from Rheims to meet him there. There "we (*Allen and Parsons*) went and lay in the same lodgings, to perform that matter better; but all would not serve. After this we imparted all our affairs with them, and upon new agreement Mr. Paget was sent into England.[2] And I went to Rome, and Mr. Brinkley with me; upon returning again in a few weeks found Mr. Paget come from England."

It was determined between Allen and Parsons that the latter should at once set out for Rome; and on 22nd August Allen gave him a letter to the Pope, earnestly beseeching "your Holiness to hear with your accustomed kindness this best and most prudent father, who is one soul with us in the Lord and most expert in English affairs."[3]

So Parsons, with written instructions from the Duke of Guise,[4] set out to induce the Pope to provide money for the proposed expedition, to confer with the General on the affairs of the Society in England, and to advocate the cause of Allen

[1] S. P. O. (*Roman Transcripts*), vol. xvii. p. 141.

[2] It was in the September that Paget, under the name of "Mope," came to England with the alleged object of concluding measures for the invasion by the Duke of Guise and King of Scots.

[3] *Record of English Catholics*, vol. ii. p. 207.

[4] These instructions were given to Parsons (22nd August 1583), under the *alias* of Richard Melino. They were to inform the Pope minutely of all that had been done for the "good success and happy result of the expedition. Money and men are needed, which latter the King of Spain will provide." "Things have reached such a point that nothing but money is now wanting," and if the Pope will "deign to

and the seminary at Rheims. In this latter he was successful; he got from the Pope a yearly grant of two thousand ducats, and Bulls appointing Allen bishop of Durham and Apostolic delegate for the intended expedition.

His stay in the Eternal City was very short; for George Gilbert, who was ill when he left, died on 6th October 1583, making his vows as a Jesuit on his deathbed.

De Tassis was annoyed at Parsons' speedy return. He writes to Philip (15th November 1583): "Melino was certainly in a hurry to obtain at Rome things which might have been deferred, but as he was there he must have thought it best to get it done apart from the rest, the more so because the wish to see accomplished, which he evidently desires, must have persuaded him (as often happens to the afflicted and necessitous) that the affair could be carried into effect in the way he imagined it."[1]

It was probably about the middle of October when Parsons returned to France,[2] bringing with him a letter from the General to Heywood, which he forwarded, this latter to meet him at Rouen. Heywood set sail at once, but when almost in port was captured, and on 9th December was committed to the Tower.[3]

augment a little his liberality, and give at once a sum of money proportionate to the greatness of the enterprise, and leave the whole business to the Catholic King and to the Duke of Guise, the expedition might start that year. They were sure of seaports in England, and will land in the Fouldrey (?), where we are sure the expedition will be welcomed and joyfully received by the Catholics, who are very numerous out there." . . . "His Holiness should also be entreated . . . to expedite a Bull, declaring that the enterprise is undertaken by His Holiness. . . . His Holiness will be pleased to create Mr. Allen bishop of Durham, and to make him, or someone else, his nuncio, etc." (Teulet, v. 308).

[1] Teulet, v. 727. Parsons was urging the Pope to make the attempt on the side of England rather than from Scotland, so as to escape embroiling himself with France.

[2] Tassis complains that no pressure had been put upon the Pope. He adds: "The proposal made to your Majesty (by the Pope) on the subject is very niggardly. With regard to the impossibility of putting the hand to the work this year, I am confident the Duke of Guise in his heart must know very well that such things cannot be done so precipitally" (Teulet, v. 317). And: "If anyone is to be trusted with furthering them at that time it should be, in my poor opinion, Allen or Melino, who, I see, have a great affection for our side, and will be delighted to forward anything pleasing to your Majesty."

[3] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 169, No. 23.

After waiting some time at Rouen for Heywood, Parsons, hearing of his capture, returned again to Paris, and had another interview with Allen. The object was to try and detach Lord Paget and Sir Charles Arundel, who had just arrived in Paris, from the faction of Paget and Morgan. But the attempt failed.

When Throgmorton was captured, and disclosed the conspiracy, all their plans were frustrated.[1] The Duke of Guise had also fallen off, too, and was busy about his own concerns. So Philip determined to take the matter entirely into his own hands, and committed its execution to the Duke of Parma, ordering him at the same time to advise with Parsons upon this and other matters. Flanders was the great place of refuge for the English exiles, many of whom were pensioners upon the charity of Philip. They were not by any means all favourable to the Spanish policy of aggrandisation, under the plea of religion, of which Parsons and Allen were the tools. Parsons had evidently spoken of the matter to the King, and shown that those who acepted of his bounty ought to serve him, or, at the least, hold themselves from opposition. It was therefore the King's wish that the Duke should confer with Parsons on the whole subject of the treatment of the English exiles, and Parsons refers to this in his *Autobiographical Notes*: "Towards the end of this summer (1583), I being not yet returned from Rome, the Prince of Parma[2] being advertised from Spain that he should confer with me, sent Mr. Hugh Owen and Mr. —— to Rheims to Dr. Allen, and from there to Paris to call me; whither I went from Rouen . . . So as I stayed in Tournai with the Prince and with Father Oliverius

[1] Elizabeth and her government were fully aware of these plots. Mendoza writing to the King reports that she says: "But notwithstanding this, I shall oppose much more cunningly than they think the carrying out of their design" (*S.S.P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. p. 395). And Philip II. himself knew of the Babington Plot. Concerning which he wrote in the pious strain he adopted even in the most monstrous circumstances: "The affair is so much in God's service that it certainly deserves to be supported, and we must hope that our Lord will prosper it, unless our sins be an impediment thereto" (M. Hume's *Philip II. of Spain*, p. 201).

[2] The whole execution is committed to the Prince of Parma, and that Father Eusebius (Parsons), Mr. Hugh Owen, and myself "should deal with no other person but solicit him only in your Majesty's affairs" (Allen to Queen of Scots, 5th February 1585, *Cotton MS. Caligula*, c. viii. 309).

(Manareus)[1] all this winter . . . About Corpus Christi Day (1584) I returned from Flanders to France; and in the way passing by Ghent to Oudenarde, Mr. Owen and I were in great peril to be taken by the English soldiers of Mechlin, if we had not escaped by flight, as I did before my journey from Louvain to Beveren, and I escaped by the benefit of a good horse."

But there is a memorial to the Pope, written by him or Allen, dated 16th January 1584,[2] which seems, by a letter of Allen's to the Cardinal of Como (21st January)[3] to have been written at Paris, whither Parsons had presently gone from Tournai for a few days. The memorial, a copy of which was sent also to Philip, is political, and speaks (as is always the case) as though the writers were acting entirely at the will of all the whole body of English Catholics. It was their perpetual harping on one string, namely, that all in England favoured Parsons' views, that misled the Pope, and was the fruitful source of mischief. Doubtless, Parsons thought that all English Catholics ought, and would eventually, dance to his piping; but he, as the event proved, had no ground for so supposing. Living in a fool's paradise, and refusing to look at anything except from his own point of view, or to entertain the idea of it being possible that what his wisdom suggested could be wrong, is in keeping with that strain of Puritanism which we before have alluded to as running throughout his history.

On his return from Tournai he remained in Paris,[4] where he was joined by Father William Weston. The result of his sojourn in Flanders is thus mentioned by De Tassis in a despatch of 27th May 1584 to the King: "Richard Melino (Parsons) has returned from Flanders. He and his companion, Allen, are still of opinion that the enterprise should be undertaken by way of England, and by no other route. They have told me in confidence that the Scotch here (Paris), vexed at the delay, are discussing the question whether it will be possible to conduct this enterprise by other hands than those

[1] The Jesuit Provincial of Flanders.

[2] *Records of the English Catholics*, ii. 222.

[3] Theiner, *Ann. Eccles.* iii. 597.

[4] *Harl. MS.* 228, fol. 154. Paris, 13th August 1584. "We have here now, and have had for some months, Father Robert Parsons, of whom I suppose you have often heard—Campion's companion" (Letter of Thomas Darbyshire, S.J.).

of your Majesty. And though the two continue to keep relations with them as well as they can, they declare the English wish for no protector but your Majesty, and that they not only look to your Majesty to set things straight at your first entry, but expect that even if the Queen of Scotland should be made their Queen you will not desert them so speedily until everything is thoroughly secured. They even say that they would be glad if your Majesty would keep some ports in your hands, the better to ensure this. It is needless to attend to the talk of the others, for it can be only windy chimeras; and it may be also that what the two say, springs from their desire the better to draw us onward. In conclusion, this much is certain: that the English wish for no other protector than your Majesty; and beneath this, it seems that anything may be believed."[1]

Parsons continues the narrative: "Mons. Duke of Alençon being dead, there is much parleying between the princes for making their league[2] that broke out the next spring after. Whereupon I, buying myself divers sort of good books, returned to live for the next winter (1584–5) at Rouen, in a void house given to the Society, in a garden where were with me Mr. Stephen Brinkley, a virtuous gentleman that translated Loartes' book under the name of James Sancer, and Mr. Flinton, an honest merchant, who both of them did help me to set forth my second edition of the *Book of Resolutions*, much augmented."

Before he left Paris, however, he wrote a long letter to his General, dated 23rd July. From it we can gather that the French Provincial—Claude Mathew—was very much opposed to the continuance of the Jesuit mission in England, and had written to Aquaviva advising not only that, for the time, no more missionaries should be sent, but that the work of printing and sending books into England was doing, at that present moment, positively more harm than good. Parsons, in alarm writes urging the General, on the other hand, to send more

[1] Teulet, v. 336.

[2] The league, of which the Duke of Guise was the real head—signed 31st December 1584—assured the support of Philip in the war which broke out in the following April against Henry of Navarre.

men into England: "Now, more than ever, is our time to go forward, seeing that God helps us so manifestly in our battles. So I pray your Paternity—for the love of God to send Fr. Henry (*Garnett*) from Rome; for the more I think of it, the more satisfied I am of his fitness. . . . And this Father Henry (*Weston*) . . . by being here, what with reading some books, and by having conversations on the matter over there, has become beyond belief on fire about it." To push matters on Parsons sent the lay brother, Ralph Emerson, to Dieppe[1] to plan new ways of crossing over to England without suspicion, and to send off with four priests, who were then going on the mission, some eight hundred of the books the French Provincial thought were doing so much harm. Parsons himself remained in Paris until he had to leave on account of the plague, which broke out in the house next to the one in which he lived. He was at Rouen again by the 30th of September. But before leaving, he wrote again to the General to remind him that it was very difficult work to obtain funds for carrying on the mission, as there were no less than three hundred seminary priests in England, and at least two hundred at Rheims; and as nearly as many more secular exiles, gentlemen stripped of all possessions, who had to be helped. Parsons' charity was universal, and he made the cause of all these his own. When settled at Rouen, he occupied himself, as we have heard, in the preparation of a new and enlarged edition of the *Book of Resolutions*, and in looking after the house at Eu. We have, at present, but little knowledge of what took place during this winter—1584–5, and the State Papers and correspondence are silent.

Philip was not a man to hurry himself; and now that, owing to the withdrawal of Guise, he had got the whole control of the proposed expedition into his own hands, he was determined to wait for a favourable opportunity before striking a blow at England's independence. Moreover, his treasury was low, for the English ships were disputing with his the

[1] Calais used to be the port, but the person employed, one John Manin or Monnier, got into trouble with the English authorities for "conveying of Jesuits." See *Articles to be administered to John Manin*, S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 157, No. 63, and vol. 178, No. 50.

control of the Spanish Main, and were seizing his vessels. Moreover, he held that the Pope should be made to pay largely for the cost of "reducing" England again to the Church. The Pope, however, having already had experience, and mistrusting Philip's assertions of disinterestedness, had made up his mind not to spend money until he saw some tangible result likely to ensue; he therefore, while prolific of promises, withheld for the present any solid help. So things were at a standstill. How this delay must have chafed Parsons, who had been loudly asserting that the autumn just passed was the most propitious moment for such an enterprise!

But, in the early spring, news of great importance came to hand. Gregory XIII. was ill. He was an old man, nearly eighty-four, and could not last long. In fact, he died 10th April 1585; and two weeks later the new Pope, Pereti, a Franciscan, was elected under the name of Sixtus V. Parsons must have heard the news with somewhat mixed feelings. For if the new Pope was known to be in a certain sympathy with the King of Spain, and therefore that everything might be hoped from him for the enterprise, yet, on the other hand, Sixtus was understood to have views not very favourable to the Society.[1]

Parsons had already left Rouen before the new Pope was chosen. This was about mid-Lent 1585. He went to Flanders to the Duke of Parma, and there must have received instructions to go to Rome; for writing from Louvain (10th May) to Agazzari, he says, "within a few months he expected to be in Rome." By the midsummer he was at St. Omers, and then went on to join Allen at Spa, where the latter was for his health. Another matter called them both to Rome. Allen had received pressing letters from the fathers of the Society, begging him to come to the city, and appease another of those serious outbreaks among the students, who were again clamouring for the expulsion of the Jesuits from the control of the English college. In the autumn the two friends set out for Rome, where they arrived 4th November.

[1] It is said, among many other stories told of this Pope, that upon his accession it was proposed that he should take a Jesuit for confessor. "What!" exclaimed he, "do the Jesuits want the Pope to go to confession to them? I think it would be more to the advantage of the Church if the Jesuits were to come and confess to me."

Philip already had his own ambassador at Rome, Olivares, who was engaged in persuading Sixtus that the enterprise against England was not undertaken for any private benefit to Spain, such as revenge for private wrongs, securing a free passage to the Indies, and solving the difficulties in the Netherlands. But Sixtus saw through the mist cast around him; and was refusing to part with his money, save and except for some good result to Holy Church. If there is anything clear in the diplomatic correspondence of the day, now at our disposal, it is that Philip's sole idea in attacking England was his own personal advantage; and that religion was made a cloak for malice. It was only with the very greatest difficulty that he consented to agree that the English Crown should not come to himself, but to the Infanta. But the real meaning of his policy was confided only to his ambassador. It may perhaps be said Parsons and Allen saw or, at this time, would only see, the religious aspect; and they acted, if indiscreetly, at least in good faith. It was therefore as a Spanish decoy-bird that Parsons was summoned to Rome. He had to keep before the Pope the religious side of the enterprise. And this gave him an opportunity of advancing the cause of Allen's cardinalate—a cause not without advantages to himself, or rather to his Society. A very great advantage which ensued, and one he used to the full, was the sanction the honoured name of the English cardinal gave to Parsons' political works, even after Allen's death. This proposed hat, and all it implied, was kept dangling before the eyes of the Jesuit by his Spanish masters, to encourage him in the work he had undertaken. Olivares, in a letter to the King (9th September 1586), says: "With regard to Allen's hat. Father Robert, who really is very prudent, intelligent, and zealous, urges strongly the advantage of not deferring this, etc.;"[1] and in a later memorandum (24th February 1587) adds: "I have held out great expectation to the Jesuit, who is the one who speaks about the cardinalate, that your Majesty will do what is requisite for the accomplishment of his desire, but without giving him any pledge."[2]

One of the first occupations of Parsons after his arrival

[1] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. p. 481. [2] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. ii. p. 253.

in Rome was to write a book against Elizabeth, which Allen was weak enough to allow to come out in his own name. It was the book afterwards known as *An Admonition to the Nobility and People of England and Ireland concerning the present Wars made for the Execution of His Holiness' Sentence, by the High and Mighty King Catholic of Spain.* It is a scurrilous and most offensive production; and its substance was reproduced in the broadside, *A Declaration of the Sentence of Deposition of Elizabeth the Usurper and pretended Queen of England*, which was likewise from Parsons' pen. These are undoubtedly the two works which Parsons alludes to as his own in the paper he gave to the Nuncio at Paris just before leaving for Spain. It is, of course, most probable that Allen would have had something to do with the latter draft—but if the hands are the hands of Esau, the voice is the voice of the Supplanter.

This book was meant as a preparation for the Armada; and Parsons gave a copy of it to Olivares, who forwarded a summary of it to Spain, to learn whether the King approved of its publication. He says: "Allen and Robert (*Parsons*) are inclined to add at the end a few pages in reply to the Queen of England's Manifesto against your Majesty; but I will keep them in play until I receive your Majesty's orders, and when they have written it I will send a copy, and if the thing has to be done, the work will be better divided; and your Majesty in this case will judge in whose name it should be published."[1]

As a matter of fact, Olivares does not seem to have had a very high opinion of Parsons' powers as a far-seeing politician. A few days after the last letter he writes again: "Allen and Melino (*Parsons*) have written for me a paper of which I herewith enclose your Majesty a copy. They have ready wit and speech about the affairs of England, and, on the other hand, they are helped by that great teacher, necessity, and this finds means to draw from everything arguments and thoughts in proof that each moment, whichever it is, is the most suitable time for the accomplishment of their desires, both as regards the principal affair and Allen's promotion."[2]

The ball is kept passing from one to the other. Philip replies (11th February 1587): "You will maintain Allen

[1] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. ii. p. 253. [2] *Ibid.* p. 268.

and Robert in faith and hopefulness that the recovery of their country will really be attempted, in order that they may the more zealously and earnestly employ the good offices which may be expedient with the Pope; but let it be in such a way that they do not think the affair so near at hand as that it will make them expansive in communicating it to others of their nation for their comfort and consolation, and so cause it to become public; for this is the way in which during these past years many things well begun for the good of that kingdom have come to nothing. Go on, then, counterbalancing and drawing profit from them, and in everything do as you are accustomed with your prudence and dexterity as the affair requires, etc."[1]

It was said that before coming to Rome it was possible that Parsons saw only the religious aspect of the recourse to arms. But now after his arrival he fully understood what Spain was aiming at both as regards England and Scotland. If Elizabeth or James were to be converted, Philip's plans would come to an end. There never seems to have been any real desire on the part of the Jesuits to secure the conversion of Elizabeth, though there were some other of the exiles who urged that all fair means should be used to win the Queen. How this more peaceful party was met is clear from a letter of Olivares to the King, written at this time (2nd January 1587), in which he says: "The English prior in Venice perseveres in his solicitations to Allen, saying it would be well to endeavour to convert the Queen of England to the faith by fair means. I have told Allen not to break the thread, but to avoid pledging himself to anything until we can learn whether your Majesty desires to make use of the man, whom Allen praises as a very appropriate instrument for deceiving the Queen whilst being himself deceived."[2] What their plans were regarding the King of Scotland is also clear from the correspondence of the period. Thus, Olivares, writing to the King (17th January 1587), exposes the situation:

"They (*i.e.* the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Pagets, etc.) are asking the Cardinal [*Mondovi, the Scotch Protector in Rome*] to beg the Pope to send the Scotch Carthusian friar,

[1] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 269.

[2] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iv. p. 1.

who was bishop of Dunblane [*Chisholm*], and is now here, with a breve from His Holiness to the King of Scotland, exhorting him to adhere to the Catholic faith, and the bishop is to be instructed to bring back news of the disposition in which he finds the King. The Cardinal intended to petition the Pope to this effect, hoping that His Holiness would accede to the request, as the bishop offered to pay his own expenses. I told the Cardinal that this was not a task to be entrusted to a person upon whom so little dependence could be placed, and recommended that he should manage to have it given to the Jesuit Edmond Hayes, who is known to him, and is a person of weight, even if they still desired to send the friar as well. The Jesuit concurs in the opinion that the King (of Scotland) will never be a Catholic or a good King, and adheres to those who made the proposals contained in my letter to your Majesty of 10th August. I can therefore through Melino [*Parsons*] arrange for him to write what may be considered convenient."[1]

In another letter (16th March 1587) he says: "I have diverted Cardinal Mondovi from the sending of that Scotch bishop, and have persuaded him to close his ears to the praises the Scotsmen are singing of their King. He has agreed to make use of that Jesuit Edmond Hayes, who is the kind of person we want, as the Pope is the man who will seize upon any branch."[2]

The party to which Parsons attached himself had given themselves wholly to furthering the Spanish King's schemes, and the Jesuit became one of the most earnest workers. Fortunately among the Spanish State Papers of the period there has been preserved a document which puts Parsons' position in a perfectly clear light. On 18th March 1587 he produced a paper entitled, "Considerations why it is desirable to carry through the enterprise of England before discussing the succession to the Throne of that country, claimed by his Majesty"; and the document is of sufficient value to be quoted *in extenso*, for it shows Parsons, who as a Jesuit was supposed to be particularly devoted to the Pope's interest, engaged in deceiving both him and the unfortunate English Catholics in the interests of the King of Spain:

[1] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iv. p. 4. [2] *Ibid.* p. 40.

"The evils and obstacles that might result from it:—

"It must be presupposed that this matter cannot be communicated to His Holiness without its reaching the ears of other persons by some channel or another, either through the natural want of secrecy in this Court, the facility with which His Holiness usually communicates his affairs, the talk of officials or ministers, who are much given to divulge such matters, and finally because His Holiness will probably not venture to decide the matter privately and without taking counsel, the case being so important.

"By whatever means the matter became public, great prejudice would thereby be caused not only to the enterprise, but to his Majesty's claim to the succession, for the following reasons:—

"The Pope himself, or various Cardinals, might perhaps conceive suspicion of his Majesty's proceedings regarding this enterprise; and the result of such vain thoughts and discourse might be that the Pope would help less liberally in favour and money, on the assertion that his Majesty was forwarding the enterprise mainly out of regard to his individual advantage. For the same reason, the other Christian Catholic princes might be moved to jealousy, for reasons of state, of the greatness of Spain, particularly the King of France, who with very good grounds would, with his friends, try to frustrate the affair. The Italian princes would do the same, especially the Seigniory of Venice, who, we are informed by Monsignor Bergamo, the new Nuncio in France, are already somewhat jealous. The princes of the House of Guise and Lorraine also will be much displeased, although they might easily be induced to join in the enterprise if the suspicions of France be not aroused.

"The same will happen with the Scots, who will be of the greatest importance in the enterprise, and they may be easily brought over to our side if this claim of his Majesty is kept secret. Cardinal Farnese and the other friends of the Prince of Parma's children, who are likewise descended from the House of Portugal, might also be disturbed if this question were discussed at the present time, although we have never heard from them that they would make any claim.

"It is obvious that the Queen of Scotland also might have her suspicions aroused, and doubt if due consideration were being paid to her person and cause. There would certainly be no lack of politicians of the party of the French and Scots to persuade her that such was the case, and the same may be said of the English Catholics both at home and abroad, as they have no leader to direct them.

"The very fact of this Spanish claim being made would greatly aggravate heresy in England, as his Majesty's participation in this enterprise would thereby become odious to all other princes, heretics and Catholics alike, with the idea that Spain wishes to dominate all Europe; and so the cause of the heretics would be more favourably regarded, on the ground that the enterprise was undertaken for reasons of state and not for the sake of religion. This would draw them close to the Scots, and the English Catholics themselves would take the oath under such circumstances, which would be a grave prejudice. France also would be drawn to them, and influence would be brought to bear upon the Pope and other princes; besides which the Scotch and French party in Paris and elsewhere, who have hitherto secretly opposed the proceedings of Messieurs Allen and Melino [*Parsons himself*], would find good reason in these circumstances to arouse the suspicions of the Queen of Scotland, the English Catholics, and other princes, by saying that all the aid that Mr. Allen has received and is receiving from his Majesty, either for himself or the seminary, has been given simply with this object. This would arouse great prejudice against him, and his dignity is not yet sufficient to allow him to defy such calumny successfully. Many other difficulties and obstacles would spring therefrom which would probably spoil the whole design, or at least would *render it immensely more difficult.*

"The advantages which would result from the King's succession not being mentioned until the enterprise be carried through.

"*First.* Inasmuch as the whole world is now of opinion that his Majesty is to undertake the enterprise in order to restore the Catholic faith, to avenge the open and intolerable injuries against himself, and especially against God's Church and the multitude of martyrs, all good Catholics in Christendom

would favour it with their prayers,[1] blessings, writings, and other aids; so that those who, for state or other reasons, or jealousy of the power of Spain, were averse to it, will not venture to oppose it. His Majesty's friends will be better able to work in favour of the enterprise, as, for instance, the Pope with the King of France, who may not be pleased with the affair; and get him to remain quiet, with the princes of the House of Lorraine and other French Catholics, whilst Allen's negotiations with the English Catholics and neutrals will be also more effectual, as he can assure them by letters, books, etc., that the only object entertained here is to reform religion and punish those who have deserved punishment. This will greatly encourage them in England. When the enterprise shall have been effected and the whole realm and the adjacent islands are in the hands of his Majesty, and the fortresses and strong places powerless to oppose him, then will be the proper time to deal with the question, because if the Queen of Scotland be dead, as she probably will be, as the heretics, having her in their hands and in the belief that the enterprise is in her interest, will kill her,[2] there will be no other Catholic prince alive whose claims will clash with those of his Majesty; whereas if she be alive and married to his Majesty's liking, the question of his Majesty's succession can be taken in hand with her authority, and the claims of the House of Lancaster asserted.

"The man who might be the Cardinal of England and the leader and head of them all, could easily bring the others to decide what might be desirable, through Parliament, if the new bishops, who are principal members thereof, were by his side as well as the lay nobles (most of the present ones being heretics, would probably be destroyed in the war, and those created in their place by his Majesty would be favourable).

"His Majesty would have much greater reason for his claim then, as the descendant of the House of Lancaster, seeing the disqualification of the other claimants, the Bull of Pius V., and

[1] It is surely superstitious to think that prayers would obtain God's blessing on deceit.

[2] The cold-blooded way in which Mary's death is calculated as a result of the deception Parsons is advocating, is a sorry feature in the character of one who claims to be of the Society of Jesus.

the will of the Queen of Scotland. He would have the advantage of a just cause, of having restored religion, and finally the votes of the estates of the realm, confirmed by His Holiness, who, it may be supposed, would not then interpose difficulties, which he might do now in order not to displease other princes. Finally, everything consists in the enterprise being effected now, so good an opportunity exists, and that the forces of England and Ireland should be in his Majesty's power, whilst some great and important Englishman should be there to manage the people and satisfy other princes, this being the most important point of all for the success of the affair, which has already been prejudiced by the delay that has taken place." [1]

On 29th January 1587, Sir William Stanley, an English officer in charge of English troops, and holding Deventer in the name of Elizabeth, deserted his trust, and gave up the city to the Spaniards. Sir William Stanley belonged to the party of which Parsons was the real head. He was in close communication with the Jesuits. To the howls of execration which went up from England at the treachery, which was unfortunately another handle for the Government to accuse the Catholics in general of disloyalty, it was considered necessary that some kind of apology should be made. "*The copie of a letter of Mr. Dr. Allen concerning the yielding up of the citie of Daventree unto his Catholic Majesty by Sir William Stanley, Knight; wherein is showed both how lawful, honourable, and necessarie that action was, and how that all others, especially those of the English nation that detain anie towns or other places in the Lowe Countries from the King Catholic are bound upon pain of damnation to do the like,*" was the result. Judging from the style and bitterness, we have no hesitation in saying it was the work of Robert Parsons, and that Allen's name was used, in

[1] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iv. pp. 41–43. Allen was not behindhand. He wrote to the King (19th March 1587), and exhorted him to undertake the enterprise against England, his unhappy country. The Catholics were clamouring for him, and he urges Philip to crown his glorious efforts in the holy cause of Christ by punishing "this woman, hated of God and man," and restoring the country to its ancient glory and liberty. He then vindicated Philip's claim to the Crown after the Queen of Scotland, as a descendant of the House of Lancaster; and ended by pronouncing a fervent blessing on the enterprise, for which he foretold complete success. Allen, about whose treasonable practices there can be no doubt, signed this letter—"Your faithful Servant and Subject" (*S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iv. p. 41).

accordance with the wish of those who reserved to themselves the right to decide under whose name political works should appear.[1] It is a shameful defence of a shameful act; and, as can be seen from its title, a deliberate attempt to corrupt the fidelity of English soldiers, in view of the coming expedition.

That this act of treachery was viewed with horror by Catholics in England can be seen from a letter which one of the Jesuits in London wrote to Parsons (23rd October 1587).

"There is chanced an extraordinary cause to move me to write unto you a thing likely to breed great division among Catholic gentlemen. The matter is, that of late being at M. O. house, there came to see me divers gentlemen who, incontinent after dinner, fell into disputation whether a Catholic man might lawfully serve against the Spaniard in the present wars of Flanders. And after great discussing to and fro they all concluded unanimously that the wars of the Low Countries were thought necessary to her Majesty and Council in the behalf of our country and comfort of our neighbours, and that a good subject ought to look no farther into the matter, and that they fight against the Spaniards as being enemies to England, and not as Catholics, which, when we had all concluded, one of the company drew forth a little book entitled, *A Copie*, etc. In which book, Mr. Allen, or someone in his name, commendeth the rendering up of Daventry, and exhorteth others unto the same. Whereupon we fell among ourselves into great altercation; but, in fine, most of us resolved that Mr. Allen would never have overshot himself so foully in these times, contrary to his former writings and protestations, and that it was not unlike some malicious man, to make our cause odious to the world, to have published this book under the name of Mr. Allen, thinking thereby to demonstrate us all traitors to our Prince and country. And therefore they request me to advertise you thereof, desiring of you therein to be resolved wholly, etc. (Signed) S. T."[2]

Meanwhile Parsons was working zealously for Allen's cardinalate; and pressure was put on the Pope to proclaim him. Sixtus said he was ready to give the hat when the King

[1] *Ut supra*, p. 114.

[2] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. ii. pp. 299–300. This is probably Thomas Stanney, a secular priest who in 1587 joined the Society.

found the income.[1] The time fixed for creating Cardinals (Advent) having gone by, and no promotion taking place Parsons tries another plan, which Olivares reports (16th March 1587): "This Father Robert understanding, from the time for the promotion of Cardinals having passed, that Allen's hat is a long way off, keeps teasing me to move the Pope to create him Archbishop of Canterbury, which (he says) will partly make up for the want of the hat; and he speaks a great deal about the importance of that dignity, and how fitting it would be if it were joined to the hat. I have shown no favour to the proposition, since the Pope would be led away by it from the subject of the hat."[2]

There was a delicate question, however, upon which the opinions of Parsons and Allen were not yet thoroughly known, namely, the question of the succession to the English throne. Parsons had advised that the question should not be raised at present. But they had to take their stand definitely on one side or the other. Was Philip's claim to be based on conquest or on right? A conference was held by Olivares with the two Englishmen. They advised at the present moment that no mention of the subject should be made to the Pope; but that as regards the right of succession, Parsons held at first that it would lie with the sons of the Duke of Parma; but then he changed his opinion and said that the right, having been united to the Crown of Portugal,[3] would follow the nature of

[1] *Calendar S. P.* (Venetian), vol. viii. p. 304.

[2] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. ii. p. 272.

[3] The following is the succession from the House of Lancaster :—

HENRY III. of Castile *m.* Catherine of Lancaster, 2nd D. of John of Gaunt.

JOHN II. *m.* Jane, D. of l'Amirante of Castile.

ISABELLA *m.* Ferdinand of Aragon.

JANE, THE FOOL, *m.* Philip the Fair, Son of Emperor Maximilian.

CHARLES V. *m.* Elizabeth of Portugal.

Philip II.

Cf. *L'art de verifier les dates* 1, p. 758.

that Crown, or, in other words, belong to Spain. The Infanta was suggested as a claimant who would meet all the requirements of the case. Parsons and Allen drew up a special paper on the succession, which was forwarded to Spain. Parsons, who had had daily conference with Heighnison, a skilful genealogist and historian, is the real author of this document, which is drawn up in Spanish.

In it they go into detail of the King's right, as heir to the House of Lancaster, but warn him that he will not be able to obtain his right except by conquest. The paper ends up with the following *résumé* of reasons which make for success: "*First*, because there is no one in all England and Scotland who can justly claim to succeed to the House of Lancaster, as has been shown. *Secondly*, because all who claim thereby the House of York are unfit through heresy and other defects. *Thirdly*, because no one outside the kingdom is known to claim to the House of Lancaster, except the line of His Catholic Majesty. *Fourthly*, because if any other should also seek to claim by the same way, they have no means of recovering their right, and expelling the usurper who now occupies the kingdom, nor would they be accepted by the English Catholics themselves. *Fifthly*, because the Queen of Scotland has ordained by her will and letters[1] that His Majesty should be heir and successor; a thing which Queen Mary, of good memory, is known also to

[1] Mary, Queen of Scots, gave up her claim to both thrones to Philip, who therefore had some kind of legal claim upon the succession. She wrote to Mendoza (20th May 1586): "Considering the great obstinacy of my son in his heresy, for which I can assure you I weep and lament day and night, more even than for my own calamity; and foreseeing how difficult it will be for the Catholic Church to triumph if he succeeds to the throne of England, I have resolved, in case my son should not submit before my death to the Catholic religion (of which I may say I see but small hope whilst he remains in Scotland), I will cede and make over to the King your master my right to the succession to the Crown, and beg him consequently to take me in future entirely under his protection, and also the affairs of the country . . . I am obliged in this matter to consider the public welfare of the Church before the private aggrandisement of my posterity" (*S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iii. p. 581). On which the King remarks (July 18): "She certainly has very greatly risen in my estimation in consequence of what she there says" (*Ibid.* p. 590). Mary made a will to this effect, which was found among her papers at Chartley. "When Cecil saw the papers, he told Elizabeth that if, now that she had so great an advantage (which is an expression they use in England), she did not proceed with all rigour at once against the Queen of Scotland, he himself would seek her friendship" (*Ibid.* p. 645).

have greatly desired in her time, namely, that His Catholi Majesty should succeed her.[1] *Sixthly*, His Catholic Majesty ha besides the cause of the Catholic religion and the injuries whic he has received from England, the vengeance due for the bloo of the Queen of Scotland, which she herself commended to hin a most just ground and necessary cause for going to war; an therefore, if he seizes upon the kingdom in so just and praise worthy a war, the title of conquest will be legitimate. *Seventhl* the losses inflicted on His Catholic Majesty by the heretics i England in the time of the present Queen, and the expens to which he has gone in this war and others in Flanders an elsewhere are so great a cause in themselves that if he were t have the kingdom in payment and compensation for them, would not be an unjust cause. *Eighthly*, the decree of th Lateran Council[2] gives to all Catholic princes the kingdom and lands which they can take from hereticks, if there is n Catholic heir remaining, which decree will be confirmed i this particular by the Bull of Excommunication issued b different pontiffs. *Lastly*, to complete and confirm the who affair, there will come in addition the voluntary election an acceptation of His Majesty, on part of the commonwealth Catholics in England, who, from regard to all these causes an considerations, and chiefly in return for the benefit of the restor tion of the Catholic faith, will with the greatest unanimity and jo embrace His Majesty's succession; and about this we have n doubt whatever; so that nothing remains for the happy con pletion of all this affair, except that His Majesty dissipates a the other difficulties by carrying the enterprise with effect soon as possible, since everything depends on the speed wi which this is done."[3]

While we can no longer give Parsons credit for not havi frankly accepted the secular policy of the Spanish monarch, is probable that for consistency's sake he still held on to th professed religious end as justifying the means. His politic education was now complete. He was thoroughly "hispani

[1] Mary, in her last letter to the Pope (23rd November 1586), says she has left kingdom to the King of Spain, "soubz vostre bon playsir."—*Lettres de Marie Stu* (Labanoff), vol. vi. p. 453.

[2] *Fourth Lateran Council*, cap. 3.

[3] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. ii. pp. 285, 286.

lated." It will be necessary, later on, to compare this memorandum with the famous *Book on the Succession*, written some years after.

The news of Mary's death had just reached Rome. Made the centre of all the intrigues of the day, Mary had to pay the penalty of the officiousness of her champions. In the correspondence of the period we do not find that they appeared to take any blame to themselves for a disaster which she foresaw as the probable result of their attempts at state-craft. Truth to tell, when the disaster did arrive, they were absorbed in other matters, and the restoration of Mary was no longer expedient. Her execution happened at a time when it could be made use of as a powerful argument for advancing their fully developed Spanish scheme. And they made no secret of the fact that they did not look upon her death in the light of a misfortune. Writes Olivares (15th June): "They (*Parsons and Allen*) do their best to convince me that it is not only no loss, but that by her death many difficulties had disappeared which could only have been removed with great labour while the enterprise was proceeding and with still greater trouble after our Lord had given it success."[1]

But they evidently felt the awkwardness of the situation. Mary had been their cat's-paw, and now that she had met with the fate they had brought upon her, they were in doubt as to their appropriate behaviour under the circumstances. As usual, they consulted the Spanish Ambassador, who writes to the King (27th March 1587): "Allen and Melino [*Parsons*] have conferred with me as to how they are to behave, as, in the doubt with regard to what they should reply and write about the death (*of the Queen of Scots*), they had refrained from replying to the letters they had received. It was decided that they were to say to anyone here who might speak to them about the matter, that it was no concern of theirs, that their great object was the conversion of the country, and they did not trouble themselves about anything beyond that. If God bestows that mercy upon them they will praise Him for it. They are not to go any further than this. The English Catholics, who in their despair at the death of the Queen of

[1] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. ii. p. 292.

Scots, may write to them on the subject, should, it is though be told to rest all their hopes on your Majesty, from whor alone can the conversion of the country be expected."[1] I another letter Olivares says (15th June 1587) that Parsons an Allen "are using every effort to convince me that, not onl will the Queen's death be no loss to the business, but wi do away with many of the difficulties which beset it, a much trouble would have had to be taken to save her durin the enterprise, and more still after God had crowned it wit success."[2]

While this was going on, and Parsons was working for th succession of Philip, he had a difficulty to contend against the person of Fr. William Creighton, who was holding out f the conversion of James and the necessity of the Pope suppor ing him in his claim to the English throne. Parsons thoug it better not to undeceive him as regards this "whim," le trouble should arise. He temporised with him, "at the sam time knowing how much better His Majesty's rule will suit th English, and also the inconvenience of being ruled by th Scotch." At the desire of Olivares, he occupied himself preparing a summary of a book to be scattered througho England when the fit moment arrived. This was evidently draft of the *Book on the Succession*. Creighton, thus treate complains loudly that "only Father Parsons doth manage th business."[3]

Parsons had now to withdraw for a whole month fro active life to make the thirty days' retreat before admission the Four Vows into the inner circles of the Society. He h

[1] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iv. p. 53. [2] *Ibid.* p. 101.

[3] "As Allen and Melino found this William Creighton to be of the same opin as his countrymen in Paris, namely, that the King of Scotland may be converted that the conversion of England by the Pope should be effected, so as to secure succession to the King of Scotland, it has been thought best not to undeceive th for the present, in order to prevent any attempt on their part to raise trouble. T (Allen and Melino) are therefore temporising with them, knowing as they do h much better for the English will be your Majesty's rule than that of the King Scots, even if the religious danger did not exist. They are, as if of their own moti writing books to be spread in England enforcing this view, when God ordains hour (which, in view of Creighton's views, they think cannot now be far distant) the whole enterprise to be undertaken" (Olivares to Idiaquez, 10th July 15 *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iv. p. 122).

probably during the previous year gone through what is called the Tertianship, or third year's novitiate, which Jesuits have to submit to after they have been out at work for some years. It would, however, have been impossible for him to perform properly all the exercises appropriated to this state. He was probably dispensed from them. At that time there were comparatively few Jesuits admitted to the Four Vows. These, the solemnly professed, formed as it were the Inner Circle of the Society, and were its picked men. In fact, they were in a sense the Society. For while those who had only been professed of the Three Vows were bound to the Society, the Society was not bound to them, and could dismiss them. But the Fourth Vow was a mutual contract. It was to men who had shown themselves not only worthy of it, but capable of ruling, that the General granted admission. Parsons made the Four Vows, 1st May 1587, and recommenced his work with renewed ardour.

At last his exertions for Allen were successful. In a Consistory held 18th July (1587) Allen was made Cardinal, "to supply," as the Pope said, "the loss of the Queen of Scotland"; but he did not say a word of the insistances of the King, or any mention of English affairs. Allen received the hat 7th August. He, good man, attributes it all to Parsons, and does not seem to have been blind to the real significance of his appointment. Writing to Barrett, at Rheims, he says: "Under God, I owe it to Father Parsons."[1]

The next business was the Armada, which sailed in the

[1] During the rest of his days, although ceasing to be President of Rheims, Allen was the recognised head of ecclesiastical affairs for England. It was not long, however, before he began to see that the intention of the English Jesuits—whom, in the largeness of heart and simple devotion to the Church, he had called in as helpers—was to exploit the English mission for their own benefit. There is always a natural tendency for a highly organised and centralised body to put party first, and to imagine that the common good can only be attained by following lines peculiar to themselves. While Allen lived, he managed with difficulty to keep the opposing elements together. His was a personal rule, and died with him. That he had several differences of opinion with the Society is certain. Agazzari writes (25th September 1596) to Parsons after his death: "Certainly, my father, it seems a great indication of the Divine Majesty and a great and visible sign of God's love towards the Company, the college, and the cause of England, that when human means fail, He almost miraculously interposes His divine hand. So long as Allen walked in this matter in union with and fidelity to the Company, as he could do, God preserved him

following July (1588). It had been the intention tha Parsons should have gone to Flanders with Allen. "Fathe Robert, the Jesuit, will go with Allen. In all the dealing which I have had with him here I find in him great fertilit of resource, and very good discretion. The Cardinal also ha great judgment, though he adapts himself ill to the frauds an deceits here current, as he takes quite an opposite course." But when there was a talk of Allen not going until the resul was known, it was still the intention that Parsons should g "such being Allen's desire, for he has more authority an practical ability than any of the others who are there." Allen, however, never went; nor did Parsons.

Parsons' views on the Armada and its defeat can b gathered from a remarkable letter to Idiaquez (4th Apr 1591), given in the next chapter. It must have been a bitte blow to him to find, after all his assurances to the contrar that the English Catholics, on the approach of the Armad did not rise against Elizabeth, but even took a prominentl active part in defence of their country.[3] Many illusions we

prospered and exalted him; but when he began to leave this path, in a moment t thread of his plans and life were cut short together."[1]

That the cause of the quarrel was not with Parsons personally is clear; for, as w be seen, up to the last the friendship remained intact, and the warm-hearted All never lost his love for his old friend and fellow-worker. It remains then that t quarrel was to be found in the restless ambition which was seeking to rule direct or indirectly the whole of the English mission. His eyes were perhaps opened the real state of affairs when he found Parsons founding a college at St. Omers a wholly unnecessary seminaries in Spain, to the detriment of his own foundations Douai and Rome. How well Allen foresaw the results history tells.

[1] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iv. p. 308. [2] *Ibid.* p. 310.

[3] After the Armada, a priest writes to Mendoza (September 1588): "I do fi and know that many good and wise men which of long time have sincerely continu in most earnest devotion to the Pope's Holiness begin now to stagger in their min and to conceive that this way of reformation intended by the Pope's Holiness is n allowable in the sight of God, by leaving the ancient course of the Church, by way excommunication, which was the exercise of the spiritual sword, and in place there to take the temporal sword, and put it in a monarch's hand, to invade the rea with force and arms." Quoted in Law's Introduction to *The Conflict of Jesuits a Seculars*, p. xviii.

[1] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. i. p. 387: "In one of the books of the period, *Answer to a Letter of a Jesuited Gentleman by his Cousin Master A. C.*, we read (p. 9): "I not Dr. Haddock (for example), their votary, write this from Rome to his friend (*Parsons*, ?) in Sp with the news of his death? 'Bene profecto obiit Cardinalis noster qui si diutius vixisset, magnum sibi et ecclesiæ dedecus peperisset.'"

dashed to the ground; and he was at last brought face to face with the fact there was no party, such as he had dreamed of, and that one had to be formed. Still the strange delusion remained that he was forming a party which would eventually secure the success of the Spaniards, and he continued to advocate a recourse to arms.

But how was it that Parsons did not go to Flanders, as had been arranged? There were several reasons. We have referred to Fr. Creighton's counter-intrigues, which Parsons treated as a "whim." Fr. William Holt had been banished from Scotland, and in 1586 went to the English college at Rome. The policy of having Italian rectors did not make for the peace of the students, so it was determined to place an Englishman at their head. Holt, being on the spot, was nominated. He held the post for a year and a half, and when he was transferred in 1588 by Parsons to Brussels as political agent for Philip and governor-general of the English Catholics in Flanders, Parsons himself for a very short while took up the post of Rector. But on 6th November 1588 he started on an important journey to Spain.

CHAPTER VI

AT WORK IN SPAIN

THE immediate cause of Parsons' journey to Spain was domestic one. Aquaviva sent him, as a *persona grata*, divert the King from favouring a large and rebellious facti among the Spanish Jesuits. The main facts of the case a these. We have already referred to an existing discontent Spain. When there is a deep feeling it only requires so little occurrence to cause it to burst out. In 1586, a certa James Hernandez wanted to leave the Society. Aquavi refused to consider valid the reasons alleged, so Hernand denounced his Provincial, Marcenius, to the Inquisition accessory, by concealment, to a recent scandal. T Inquisitors were only too glad to have an opportunity bringing the Jesuits under their power. They remember the old quarrels with Ignatius, and had for long looked with kindly eye upon his sons. The King, too, had begun to f that he had in the Society a rival to his scheme of univer domination, and listened willingly to the complaints of t dissatisfied. He used to say that he could see through other Orders, but the Jesuits he could not understand.[1] moreover had conceived a personal antipathy against the n General, Aquaviva, who was a Neapolitan. When the lat heard that the Inquisitors had arrested the Provincial a other fathers compromised, he at once went to the Pope; a knowing how to deal with the weak side of Sixtus V., induc him to call the affair before his own tribunal, and to order t Holy Office at Valladolid to send all the papers connec with the case to Rome.[2] The Inquisitors there had made

[1] Ranke, *History of the Popes* (ed. Bohn), vol. ii. p. 84.

[2] "The character of Sixtus V. made it particularly easy for Aquaviva to excite antipathies of that pontiff against the proceedings of the Spaniard. Pope Sixtus

CLAUDE AQUAVIVA, S.J.

GENERAL OF THE SOCIETY, 1581—1615

From an engraving by Wierx

raid on the Jesuit house, and secured all their papers. A regular schism now broke out. At a congregation of the province, Fr. Denis Vasquez demanded that the Spanish Jesuits should be governed, as were the Dominicans, by a Commissary, independent of the General. Aquaviva attempted to move out of Spain some of the infected fathers; but the Inquisition forbade any Jesuits of the Peninsula to leave the King's dominions, even to go to Rome, without their leave. This last made Sixtus V. very angry. "What!" exclaimed he, "do they dare mock us in this way, and arrogate themselves the right to prevent appeals to our Apostolic Chair? Men we have ordered to send in to us the acts of the case of Marcenius, and who have dared to disobey us!" He at once sent a strict order to Cardinal Quivoga, the Grand Inquisitor of Spain, to give up at once all papers belonging to the Society, and to forward the process against the Jesuits, adding with his own hand: "If you don't instantly obey, I, the Pope, will depose you of your office of Grand Inquisitor, and will take off your cardinal's hat." Sixtus V. meant business. He was glad, too, of this opportunity of having the Constitution of the Society brought officially before his notice, so that he might make certain radical changes he was already contemplating as necessary for the welfare of the Church.

At the same time Philip was formulating a policy of his own. He had lately appointed Manriquez, bishop of Carthagena, as royal visitor over all the religious houses in his kingdom. His intention was to establish a certain harmony in the various constitutions, and to have something to say in their methods of government. The Jesuits, even those in rebellion, saw the danger to their independence. They united to ward off the blow. They appealed to the Pope and to the King. Sixtus counselled certain modifications; the King demanded other changes in the Constitution for which the Spanish fathers were clamouring. Aquaviva did not consider it his duty to accept either the Pope's counsels or the King's wishes, which he

formed the hope, as we know, of rendering Rome more decidedly than it ever yet was the metropolis of Christendom. Aquaviva assured him that the object really laboured for in Spain was no other than increased independence of Rome" (*ibid.* ii. p. 85).

thought destructive of the very essence of the Society. H began a series of masterly negotiations with Pope and King But as Philip was personally adverse to the General, Parson was sent to Spain to use his address, and detach the Kin from the position he had taken up. He succeeded on th point of the visitor; and the King allowed Aquaviva t nominate one visitor, while he appointed another for hi houses in Spain.[1] But it was not until after the death c Clement VIII. (1605) that the Spanish disturbances quiete down.

The business concluded, why did not Parsons return t Rome? It appears that the tension which certainly no existed between Allen and the Jesuits, had somethin to do with his remaining in Spain. In *A Reply to F Parsons' Libel*, by W. C., one of the most temperate c all the books written against him, this reason is openl given. "Into which the worthy Cardinal Allen, lookin more narrowly, saw right well, and therefore detected suc proceedings in his latter days as you may plainly see i Mr. Charles Paget's answer for himself, in the end of D Ely's books against the *Apology*. Where also you ma perceive how far he was from going with Fr. Parsons favouring his proceedings, whom he held for a man a violent and headstrong spirit, and much complained there And if it had so pleased God that he had lived, Fr. Parson would have found that he had disliked his courses, an

[1] In 1592, at the request of the King, who voiced the claims of Spanish faction, t Pope, during the absence of Aquaviva from Rome, on a mission to the Dukes Parma and Mantua, gave orders that a General Congregation should be summone Aquaviva had always opposed the meeting of this, the supreme, authority. T General felt the same repugnance to a General Congregation as the Popes had t Council. By securing the election of deputies, the General, according to a memor addressed to Clement VIII., was able to domineer with supreme authority, sway everything to his will, fearing no one and browbeating all, pulling down the gr and most deserving men of the Society, almost killing them, and thus sacrificing public good to private favour. But he had to compromise. "What had been refused the King was now commanded by the Pope. By the plentitude of his apostolic pow he determined and ordained that the assistants and rectors should be changed ev three years, and at the expiration of every sixth year a General Congregation sho be assembled" (Ranke, p. 87). This, however, did not secure obedience. Nea fifteen years of domestic commotions passed before the next (VI.) congregat assembled (1608).

would have curbed him for them. But he lived not, and some say his death was not without suspicion. It is certain that whilst he lived Fr. Parsons kept himself aloof in Spain, but after his death he hastened him, as soon as he could conveniently, to Rome."[1] This seems to be a sufficient reason. Parsons dare not openly oppose Allen, who was now, more than ever, the superior of English ecclesiastical affairs. Instead of removing Allen from the head as he had hoped, the destruction of the Armada had resulted in keeping him at Rome in a more powerful position. Another attempt, however, was made soon after, through Philip, to remove him from Rome by appointing him Archbishop of Malines. But this came to nothing; and the Cardinal was left quietly to die in Rome. So as Parsons was in Spain, he began a work which he thought would strengthen his position in the near future.

What was the measure of Parsons' success up to the present moment? He had succeeded in getting the English college into the hands of the English Jesuits; Allen was removed from the seminary, and as Dr. Barrett, who "walked in union with and fidelity to the Society," was now the President, it was most likely, in the course of things, that that seminary also would fall into their hands. But the possibility of its retaining its independence had to be provided for; and Parsons determined to take advantage of his stay in Spain to start other colleges for training secular priests under the Society. It is good, says the prophet, for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth. Parsons agreed with the prophet. Besides the immense advantage and influence such colleges would give the English Jesuits, they would be useful in another way. The one hope of regaining England was, in Parsons' eyes, not the patient toil and blood of missionaries, but the armed intervention of Spain. The zealous young men who offered themselves to the seminaries as soldiers of Christ, found that they were also required to be soldiers of Philip. The policy of thus bringing up young men in Spain itself, where they would have the glories of that great country before their eyes, and would live in an atmosphere thoroughly Spanish, and be accustomed

[1] P. 55.

to live on Spanish generosity[1] would in itself tend to habituat them to the idea of Spanish dependence.[2] Nor did Parson intend to influence only these young men. His plan was, a will be seen, that students from other colleges should als spend some time in Spain before they went back to England so that they, too, might be "hispaniolated." When an ide once got hold of his mind, he bent his energies to carry it ou in all its details. His work in Spain will always be a lastin monument of his untiring energy, and at the same time of hi misdirected zeal.

[1] Others saw through this palpable device. Cardinal d'Ossat writes: "Th object of these institutions is to instil into the minds of the missionaries, the Spanis political creed; and for that, rather than the Catholic faith, were they, if necessar to suffer martyrdom." If a Catholic prelate held these views, is it wonderful th Elizabeth and her Council shared in them and acted accordingly?

[2] A letter from one of the young students shows the glamour which the Cou exercised upon their impressionable minds. Henry Bell writes the following lett to Fr. William Holt:—

"MADRID, 13*th March* 1596.

"RIGHT REVEREND FATHER,—At my arrival in Spain I write unto you of o perilous journey, and how Almighty God wonderfully brought us safe to land; no it remaineth that I recount such occurrences as have happened since that tim Upon St. Thomas of Canterbury's day we came to Valladolid, where Fr. Parso received us with great contentment to us all. There I staid by his appointment t Sexagesima, and after with five other priests was sent to Madrid. Father Cressw showed great affection to us all and to me in particular; as in truth I never feare On Ash Wednesday, his Majesty lying three leagues from Madrid, Father Cressw sent to know his Majesty's pleasure when we should come to him. His Majes appointed us to be at the Court Friday following, by nine of the clock, and so were. But Father Cresswell brought me to Don Juan de Idiaquez and Jo Christobal de Mora, to whom I did that which the Father had before appointe By this time one of us was sent for to say Mass before the Prince and Infanta in t King's chapel, which ended, the King made haste to hear Mass sooner than ordina in regard of us. Shortly after, we were brought by John Christobal de Mora to presence chamber, where we found the King sitting in great majesty, but so mild with the Prince standing at his left hand, all his noblemen and cavaliers, to no sm number, attending at the lower end of the presence chamber. Between the K and noblemen Father Cresswell entered in and brought us with him, and all kneel at the first, but presently his Majesty made sign with his hand we should rise Father Cresswell drew near to the King, and, after some private speeches for space of three *Paternosters* while, he called me from the rest of our company, to sp unto his Majesty, who gave great attention and smilingly endured with silence, time of my speech, which ended, his Majesty spoke to me again as being glad to us and willing to assist us in anything, with many great good words to that eff desiring to be commended to all the Catholics of England, and that they pray him and the Prince, assuring them he was mindful of them and would do them go This done, Father Cresswell had more private speech with his Majesty, and so

When he arrived in Spain he hastened to Valladolid where the King then was. After getting his consent to the question of the proposed visitor, Parsons laid before him the scheme for the seminary, appealing, without doubt, both to his religious and political senses. The King, however, was sore about the Armada, and had no wish to spend more money. The times were peculiarly unpropitious. But Parsons managed the King so skilfully that at last he gave consent. The negotiations must have taken some time; for in the autumn of 1589 they only seem to be at an end. The Venetian Ambassador writes to the Doge and Senate (14th October 1589): "The necessary preparations for erecting a college of English Jesuits at Valladolid are being made. The King raised many difficulties before giving his consent, but finally permission was granted, provided that no one should be received into the college without having first produced a certificate of the place whence he came, his profession, and his catholic manner of life."[1] The consent, however, seems to have been given earlier in the year; for, at the beginning of May, three students were sent from Rheims to begin the new foundation. But there were other difficulties, which More mentions. There was already a small Irish college in Valladolid, and the superiors did not see with

departed. The noblemen were almost at strife who should have us to dinner, and had it not been Lent we should surely have dined that day. After dinner, his Majesty being to remove some two leagues, sent us word to come to him at his taking of coach, but commanded we should not wet ourselves, for it rained a little. We had not expected half a quarter of an hour, but his Majesty came down with the Prince and the Infanta, whose hands we kissed with such an applause of the noblemen and courtiers, as you would wonder. In fine, all the noblemen, noblewomen, and courtiers there did greatly congratulate us, and showed such love and affection as more could not be desired. Don Juan de Idiaquez, Don Christobal de Mora, the Count of Fonsalida, Count of Chinchon, and many other noblemen embraced us. At Madrid, for five or six days, Father Cresswell carried us up and down to visit noblemen and women, they sending their coaches for us and giving us great entertainment. Some of his Majesty's Council and other grandees made great protestation that his Majesty's intent and their desire was only to set in England a King Catholic and to have it their friend; to conquer or possess our country they had no such meaning, nor the King; and surely their countenances and affection to us and our country persuaded us no less. Here is gathering of soldiers every day for an Armada . . . I am already, God be thanked, received into the Society at Madrid by Father Visitor, that was Assistant in my time at Rome, and now I am to-day to go towards the place of my probation," etc. (Foley, vi. pp. 170, 171).

[1] *C. S. P.* (Venetian), No. 885.

favour the beginnings of an English establishment. The Irish raised objections, claiming that the English should either join them or go elsewhere. On appeal to the King, the matter was submitted to the Benedictine abbat of Valladolid, who decided that the English should remain in the town; but left the question of union to settle itself.[1] The Irish eventually gave way, and made a foundation at Salamanca. Parsons set to work to collect funds for building a college. Don Alfonso de Quiñones, the Duchess of Feria (Jane Dormer), Sir Francis Englefield, with many of the Spanish nobility, were the first benefactors. Parsons drew up rules for the students, gave them an academical dress, and before the end of September saw the foundation in full working order. It was placed under a Spanish rector; for the native Jesuits were naturally determined to keep all establishments under their own direction. But such an arrangement was a fertile source of dissension in the near future. In the course of the next year twenty more students from Rheims—one of whom was John Parsons, probably the nephew of the great man—and some from Rome, came to form the new seminary. They attended the free lectures given twice a day at the Jesuit college in the town. The King, at Parsons' persuasions, fixed an allowance of sixteen hundred crowns, and other benefactors raised it to an annual income of four thousand crowns.

But, from the beginning, Parsons had great difficulties with this foundation. It was by no means a success in any way. The royal grant was found to be an empty one, and it was with the greatest difficulty that he was able to get the money from another source. Then another great disappointment, the original chief benefactor, Don Alfonso de Quiñones, seems to have lost his enthusiasm for the new college, though he kept up his usual grants; for when he died (May 1592) he left all his money elsewhere, and said that the King would look after the institution. Debt had been incurred on account of the new buildings, and there was no money to meet it. In 1592 Parsons betook himself to Madrid; but met with ill success. Benefactors would not come forward. He presented the King with a book he had written (probably the account of the

[1] *Historia*, p. 158.

martyrs), and asked him as a reward to give him licence to impart a quantity of English cloth, in order to sell for the benefit of the college. The petition was granted, and so well did Parsons play the trader that he gained four thousand crowns, which was enough to free the college entirely from debt.[1]

What Parsons' idea was can be gathered from a letter written (7th November 1590) from Valladolid to the President at Rheims: "These priests (John Cecil, Fixer, Younger, Blunt, Dudley, Lockwood, Rooke, and Galloway) have well behaved themselves here, and well reposed themselves, and done themselves much good many ways by this year's staying here, etc. . . . Three or four of them shall go by the port of Viscay and Galicia; and the rest with me to Andalusia; and in the way shall see the King and his Council; and have occasion to make speeches to divers great personages, chapters, and the like, which will much notify and justify our cause that was utterly unknown heretofore; and if they did send me another such mission of priests from Rome that would stay here and repose themselves for some months, and live in discipline as these have done, I would take them and help them from hence, and add to the viaticum they bring from Rome, if it be not sufficient to pass them over from hence, as we have done to these. . . . Wherefore when the subjects be good and able men, and capable of discipline, I will offer the Rector of Rome that if he will send three or four a year this way . . . that I will receive them here and cherish them . . . and so we shall hold them in the spirit of their vocation, and put them safely in England, and by their experience of this country make them more able men to serve, and together edify this people."[2] How well in time the students learnt their lesson of loyalty to Spain is shown by a speech made to the King when he paid them a visit[3] in 1592, in which they spoke of "not our,

[1] *Annales Collegii Anglorum Vallesoletani* (printed for private circulation, 1899). See below.

[2] *Hatfield Manuscripts*, vol. iv. p. 69 (*Hist. MSS. Com.*).

[3] This royal visit was most encouraging. The author of the *Litteræ Annuæ* for 1595 thus muses on the results: "*Haec nos urgere debent ad ea paranda praesidia humilitatis, charitatis, aliarum virtutum quibus respondere possimus opinioni quam de nobis homines conceperunt*" (p. 156). Having basked in the smiles of Royalty, the Jesuits felt they and theirs must live up to their position.

but your England." The speech was written by Parsons, and afterwards published by him in various languages to spur on the King to undertake another expedition.[1]

The words of the above letter "our cause that was utterly unknown heretofore" require some explanation. Parsons had now spent nearly two years in Spain, and had come to realise the Spanish feeling towards Englishmen, a feeling which was both disdainful and distrustful. How could it be otherwise with a nation, all their faults besides, that was a type of chivalry? Treachery such as Sir William Stanley's, and Parsons' own, would naturally make the Spanish, while profiting by it, distrustful of the plotters.[2] This, joined to the constitutional ignorance of English affairs, which seems inherent in the Latin races even to this day, is quite sufficient to account for what must have been to Parsons a distressing and unwelcome revelation. Although he complained bitterly, he did not lose heart. While he had the King's ear, and went on encouraging him, by hope against hope, to undertake the conquest of England, he continued to found colleges, one at Seville in 1592, where three years later he secured permanent buildings.[3] One was also started at Madrid. He also obtained a footing in the Residence of the English Clergy at St. Lucar, founded in 1517 as a house of English merchants. The fraternity, in 1591, agreed to make over the buildings and endowment to the English Clergy in perpetuity. At Valladolid, in 1591, almost all the students fell ill. Eleven died, and Parsons himself was stricken; but as soon as he was able he went into Andalusia to beg and to arrange for the said college at Seville. Whilst there he had several opportunities of showing kindness to some unfortunate Englishmen,[4] who were confined

[1] T. G. Law's *Archpriest Controversy*, ii. pp. 90–95.

[2] John Fixer, one of the students and an intelligencer, writing to Walsingham (21st and 22nd May 1591), says Stanley is little esteemed by the Spaniards, who quote Cæsar's saying, "Love the treason but hate the traitor." They are angry with him for pointing out defects in their military plans. The King is very unfaithfully served by his officers, and consults with Parsons and the Jesuits. S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 238, Nos. 162, 163.

[3] "In Seville also dwells Fr. Parsons, the Jesuit, who buildeth a college there, as hath with him many English students" (*Hatfield MSS.* vol. v. p. 504; Examination of John Gough of Dublin, 21st December 1595).

[4] Examination of Constantine Eckelles (27th March 1597). "While there

in the galleys as prisoners of war. Parsons visited and consoled them, and succeeded in reconciling some of them to the Church. Soon after his first arrival he thus gained ninety-three galley slaves. This was on 3rd March. There was a difficulty to know what to do with them; to send them back to England, or to induce them to serve the King. He opens his mind on this matter in the following important letter to Idiaquez, the King's secretary:—

"SEVILLE, 21*st April* 1591.

"Besides what I wrote some days ago about the conversion of the English in the galleys, I am writing a few lines to His Majesty about the signs which there are that their conversion has been very genuine, and this for the reasons which your Lordship already knows, and which I will tell you on my return; and although I am well aware that His Majesty will show you the letter itself, still I have wished to send you a copy of it for greater security. As to the substance of the affair I have nothing to add to your Lordship, unless it be to tell you plainly, with that confidence I commonly make bold to use to you, that I have been amazed at the lukewarmness with which the willing submission of the English, which they have offered with so much love, and such great danger and loss to themselves, has been received.

"It will be a very good thing for them, as far as their temporal interests are concerned, to send them back to their own country when their expected ransom arrives; and as to their spiritual welfare I trust in God that wherever they go the greater part of them will always remain firm in the faith; which is the only thing which affects me. But whether it be better for His Majesty's service is a point which ought to be considered. Certainly I, for my part, feel sure that if our enemies had a like opportunity of doing honour to themselves

(Seville), Frs. Parsons and Thomas Walpole, the latter of whom is the head of the English college there, came daily to persuade them to alter their religion; and in the end prevailed so far with the Cardinal of Seville that twelve or thirteen were released and brought to the college, where they used all means they could to reconcile them to the Church, whereupon they all reformed and received the Sacrament (save Captain Crosse, who went off to the Inquisition)." (S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 262, No. 86.)

and damaging us by means of our own people, they would not let it slip in the way, but would use it with the greatest diligence and ostentation.

"Most certain it is, that to think it possible to get the upper hand in England without having a party within the realm is a great illusion, and to think to have this party without *forming it* and keeping it together is no less an illusion; nor is there anything so opposed to the accomplishment of this as the distrust with which, up to the present time, the English, even those who are Catholic, have been treated on all occasions; and I would relate these to your Lordship, one by one, if what took place at the time of the Armada, when it was manifested before all the world, did not suffice for all; since on that occasion, though His Majesty had more need than ever to avail himself of his party, no account was made of it, nor was any confidence placed in any living person of the nation, either within or without the realm, though there were many who would have given assistance, and who had before then offered their lives to serve His Majesty.

"This was deeply felt by all the good men of the nation, as it seemed to them that their most faithful affection for His Majesty did not deserve to meet with a distrust so notorious to the whole world. It also gave them much pain to hear that some of His Majesty's principal ministers were in the habit of saying (and this I know to be the truth) that they did not understand that there were any Catholics in England, and that if any should say he was a Catholic, they would be very cautious in believing him, and if any should wish to be converted they would not receive them without caution, etc.

"From this, your Lordship sees what would have happened to the poor Catholics if victory had been on our side; and this must necessarily have happened to them, not only because the ministers knew and loved them so little, but likewise, and chiefly from the mistrust in which they held all the good men of the nation who would have enlightened them about the rest. And since God, as I take it, would not let His servants be thus outraged by our own people, after they had suffered what they had from the heretics, He let the expedition meet with the fate we have seen; and I have no hope of anything better until

means are used more proportioned to the holy end of the sincere reformation of that kingdom, which is the object aimed at, than those which were employed on that occasion, although there is no doubt of His Majesty's good intention.

"I write this to your Lordship on the occasion of the distrust which has been manifested about receiving into His Majesty's service the English who have been converted in the galleys; and I do not say it to prevent the question being very carefully considered from the point of view of security; on the contrary, I desire this above all things; but at the same time I maintain that no credence should be given to those who, in order to appear prudent and careful, seek to raise doubts and suspicions about all strangers; for this is not always prudence or piety, but is often an infirmity and springs from ourselves, and is the cause of great evils, especially of enmities; for where there is suspicion and distrust there is neither love nor fidelity; nor is there anything in the world so calculated to make men desperate as to be treated with distrust in return for good will, and the more universal and national the treatment is, so much the worse.

"As I have begun to speak on this subject, I will mention also this in particular. During the thirty years Elizabeth has reigned in England, there have come to serve His Majesty, in Flanders and elsewhere, a great number of English Catholics, who might have done great things and inflicted great injury on the Queen, and many of them were men of quality, who lost what they possessed as a consequence of joining this side, and others remained in England on the watch to join them, if it should turn out well with them, but they have never met with confidence in anything of importance, so they have all in fact come to nothing; and this has been the case not only with individuals, but with companies and regiments of soldiers also, and all through the little love for them, and care on the part of the ministers to treat them well and maintain them; although, indeed, those who are of the party of our Morgan and Paget have sought to ascribe it to a higher source, namely, the distrust which His Majesty has, and all this nation entertain towards even the Catholics of England, an opinion which has indeed been refuted by the Cardinal and others, as your Lordship

is partly aware, and which has been a very fountain of discord.

"I have written more on this head than I had thought to do, but not more than the importance of this affair of the converted English deserves; in regard to which, as it is a new case, and one which has never happened before, and is very notorious on all sides, great attention will be paid to what His Majesty will do in the matter; and if little account be made of them, your Lordship need not fear that others will follow their example, or that those who are in England will expect to be better treated when the Spaniards arrive there; and I take it that this alone will cause more distrust and despair to our friends there than anything else which has happened up to the present time. May God guard all for the best!

"There is no need to write more on this subject in general, nor to weary your Lordship any more with additional papers, since those we have written are more than enough. Your Lordship said to me in the Escurial that it would be either this year or never; and since we are already in the former, and I see such a small amount of preparation, it makes me think that perhaps God wills the latter. 'Fiat voluntas ejus sicut in cœlo ita et in terra.'"[1]

One of the priests who was sent to Valladolid from Rome, and whose conduct Parsons praises in his letter to Dr. Barrett, was John Cecil. He was one of those taken to start the college at Seville. He lost no time in putting himself into communication with Burghley, and under the name of John Snowden, began a series of informations which throw light upon Parsons' political intrigues at this period. In the informations of Snowden (26th May) we find that even he, a seminary priest (and one, too, who always kept to his religion and was zealous for his order), saw the political danger that the seminaries had become in the hands of the men who were trying to use them for their own political purposes. He goes so far as to suggest the possibility of dissolving, or at least diminishing, their number; "for many Catholics at home and abroad dislike the violent proceedings of the Cardinal and

[1] *Records of the English Catholics*, ii. p. 329.

Parsons in bringing in foreign forces and potentates against their own country. . . . The King of Spain's grounds for invasion were false, few, and feeble; the chief is the hope that no sooner shall he land an army in England than swarms of people of all degrees will leap up to assist him; for Parsons has published in a book that there are three thousand or four thousand professed Catholics in England who are wonderfully affectionate to the Spaniards."[1] He also states that "no one Catholic authority, be he ever so learned and beloved, can counterpoise the Cardinal and Parsons among Catholics abroad; so that the Catholics in England must form a corporation to gain authority, and then dissolve the seminaries, and discharge the Cardinal from the management of English affairs."[2] This is far easier than to succeed by blood or cruelty. And as regards putting priests to death, it is a mistake: "Parsons gapes after some such windfall to give credit to his seminaries."[3] He then gives a list of those abroad who dislike the course of Parsons, but dare not declare themselves, because they see no remedy nor relief.[4]

On his way to England, Cecil was taken prisoner by the Queen's ship *Hope*. He informs Burghley that "the commission that Parsons gave me at my departure from the port with the Adelantado,[5] was, first, that I should assure all Catholics publicly that the Spaniards meant no conquest, but reformation of religion; that I should in the Adelantado's name (if in the war he be General as he doth greatly desire it,

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 238, No. 180. About this book, which was dedicated to the Infanta, Snowden says: "Fr. Parsons' drift in his book of the new martyrs in England and the seminary of Valladolid, is to persuade the people that the King has the heart of more than a third part of the realm; and that they are ready to assist him and have no hope but in Spain" (*ibid.* vol. 239, No. 78). The book also contains the statements that thirty thousand Catholics were in prison, when, according to Snowden, there were not two hundred, and that three-fifths of the people were Catholics, when the contrary is the truth (*ibid.* No. 87). This book, *Relacion de Algunos Martyrios* (Madrid, 1590), is a Spanish version of Parsons' earlier work on the same subject, published in various languages in 1581. There is added an *Informacion* of fourteen pages on the Seminary of Valladolid.

[2] It may be asked whether at this period the seminaries did not do more harm than good to the cause they sought professedly to sustain.

[3] *Ibid.* No. 168.

[4] *Ibid.* No. 181.

[5] Don Martin de Padilla, Conde de Agatha, Admiral of Castille and General of the galleys.

and Parsons and the rest labour privately to procure it) assure the Catholics that all the King's intentions and the wishes of war were only for their own sake; that I should send a list of all such as were resolute to help the Spaniards, and privily between Parsons and me, he willed me, howsoever I found them opposed, that I should make the Spaniards believe that the number of their favourites was great, and their hands and heart ready when they should see an army on foot, to stand with them; and in truth this is the only bait that the Cardinal and Parsons feed the King withal—that the Catholics in England are his, and that they depend all upon the direction of them which are capital enemies, not only of the present state, but of the Catholics themselves in England; in respect of their practices abroad, poor men suffer hard at home."[1]

The statements in this information are borne out by facts. They cannot be doubted. The deception as to the state of England can only be excused on some theory of equivocation or culpable ignorance. With Parsons' acknowledgment that a party had to be formed and kept together, it is impossible to accept this latter alternative.

Another of these priests, James Younger, also gives information (27th August 1592):

"Spaniards returned from England speak much of persecution there progressing, pitying those who venture their lives by returning there. On this Fr. Parsons wrote a little book dedicated to the King's daughter in behalf of the college for its better maintenance he sent a mission of six priests to England, and on their journey to St. Lucar caused them by the way to stir up noblemen and collegiate and cathedral churches to give alms for the foundation of the new Valladolid college; I made a short speech to the Cardinal of Toledo signifying the great good that might come to the Catholic Church if his Grace would favour Englishmen who began to show the fruit of the alms, etc., by sending six priests in one year[2] into the vineyard of England. He promised to maintain ten students yearly, and to write to noblemen to do the same many more made like promises. At Seville their journey was

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 238, No. 160.

[2] All these, however, had been brought up at other colleges.

stayed for six months upon the hope of a new college being erected there by the Cardinal and citizens. . . . Yet after the death of the Queen of Scots, both Allen and Parsons sought to stir up the Spanish King, who never could be persuaded to attempt anything against England in his lifetime, objecting that he should travail for others . . . Stayed at Seville six months expecting a college to be erected there, and had daily access to Fr. Parsons, who always said an army would shortly be sent to England, and that the King had sworn to be revenged of England, although he spent all he had—even to the socket of his candlestick. Fr. Parsons wrote to Sir William Stanley, then absent, to go to Italy to see Rome, and thence to Flanders, that, by favour of Idiaquez, the King had yielded for the first attempt against England; but not till 1593, because of hindrances in France; that he hoped by that time to have brought in Brittany, and have thence 16 great ships, and 10,000 men and more commodity to come to the Irish Kerns, his old acquaintance."[1] And in another (14th September), he goes on: "Yet to my knowledge and as far as my poor judgment can reach, the only man who this realm need fear is Parsons, who, both by his travail and credit, which he hath gained exceeding great with the Spaniard, ceaseth not to solicit the King and his counsellors by all means possible; he only is the man that both maintaineth the Cardinal and Stanley in that account which they have, whose writings are so common in Spain, that there is not one man here executed for his religion who there is not known, and sermons preached openly in praise of the party, with bitter inveighing against the cruelty of the present government. If this man were displaced I think the forwardness of the Spaniard would cool by itself; and for other foreigners no great doubt in my conceit need be had, etc."[2]

We must now consider the question whether Parsons did or did not share in the plots made at the time against Elizabeth's life. Did he who, without the slightest doubt, was aiming at her throne, stop short at countenancing any attempt upon her person? It is unhappily, as we have seen, the case that Churchmen of the very highest rank were not only

[1] *Ibid.* vol. 242, No. 121.

[2] *Ibid.* vol. 243, No. 12.

cognisant but approved of such attempts; and that, when the plots were made public, the Pope himself did not protest Mariana, a Spanish Jesuit, openly taught regicide.[1] If rebellion can be justified, then assassination as a natural result will appear to most people to be also justified; for rebellion is war, and slaying in war is held to be without blame. It would take but little casuistry to prove that such an assassination was only an act of war. Parsons is deliberately charged, on the voluntary confession of Gilbert Laton, of practising with Sir Francis Englefield and Idiaquez for the Queen's destruction. Laton says that in June 1596 he left England for Dieppe, and on 8th October set out for Spain with some priests. They were taken and conveyed to Corunna to the Marquise of Seralva, who committed them to prison and on 4th May (1591) they were sent to the galleys at Ferrol. Set at liberty, 6th January 1592, they came to Valladolid, where they found Fr. Parsons, who had assisted in obtaining their enlargement. "They being in the English college, he propounded a proposition whether they did not think it lawful and meritorious to take away the life of an heretical and usurping princess? He proved it with many arguments, and persuaded Laton and a companion, Roscester to undertake to kill Her Majesty, and they took the Sacrament to perform the same . . . At Easter 1592, Laton had private conference with Idiaquez, who declared that Laton's enterprise was not for the particular good of one nation only, but all Christendom; and to encourage him offered to make him a knight of Jerusalem . . . Parsons declared before Latwise (Rogers) what Laton should perform, and advised him to lose no time but to take the first occasion that should offer itself and showed how it might be performed; Her Majesty being

[1] Mariana in his work *De Rege et Regis institutione* discusses (ed. 1605) the question, *An tyrannum opprimere fas sit*; and calls the murder of Henry III. by Jacques Clement "insignem animi confidentiam, facinus memorabile" (p. 53); and adds, "Caeso Rege ingens sibi nomen fecit. . . . Sic Clemens ille periit, virgo quatuor natus annos, simplici juvenis ingenio, neque robusto corpore, sed major vi vires et animum confirmabat" (p. 54). There can be little doubt but that such theologians would have excused any murderous attack on Elizabeth. Bellarmine (*Opera omnia* (ed. 1619), vol. ii. p. 555, *De Laicis*, lib. iii. cap. xxi.) says: "Posse Hereticos ab Ecclesia damnatos, temporalibus poenis et etiam morte mulctari"; but cautiously adds, a few pages on, if the Catholic party are the stronger (pp. 561, 562

in her progress, with a wire made into jeinos or with a poignard."[1]

There is probably a modicum of truth in this. That Idiaquez made such a proposal is likely; that Parsons, perhaps theoretically, would hold the lawfulness, and have been glad of the result, is also likely. But that he would have thus put himself into the power of a comparative stranger is, to our own knowledge of the man, wholly incredible. The question raised—perhaps by Mariana's ideas—was very likely discussed openly in the Seminary; but Parsons, who very seldom mixed with the students, was in the habit of passing off such subjects with a laugh.[2] That such topics were, once at least, seriously considered at Valladolid we know from the confession of Father Henry Walpole (13th June 1594); in which we learn also how Parsons expressed himself on that occasion: "Father Parsons, I remember, told me and others in favour with him at Valladolid, that he had received news out of Flanders that some in England did confess their purpose to have killed the Queen's Majesty. And I did ask him apart what he did think of Parry's attempt; he said that Catholics, chiefly we religious men, ought to suffer violence, but offer none, chiefly to princes; and he added that their means were by persuasion and prayer, and that though it was not presently, yet no doubt the seminaries[3] would at length reduce England to the faith."[4]

But considering that on his own side, Parsons, "that most religious man," as he calls himself, did not confine himself to persuasion and prayer, and that he was not likely to disclose his aims to a man like Henry Walpole, the utmost one feels able to say in answer to the question—Did Parsons directly share in the plots against Elizabeth's person? is "Not

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 244, No. 55.

[2] "Touching any speeches, either of Fr. Parsons or any other touching Her Majesty or the conquering of the realm, I never heard them use any, but that Fr. Parsons used sometimes to jest in the time of recreation which he very seldom kept" (Thomas Pallyson to Mr. Wood (March 1596), *Hatfield MSS.* vol. vi.).

[3] Sir Francis Englefield, Parsons' friend, writing (8th September 1596) to the King, refers thus to the intended influence of the seminaries: "Even the seminaries, powerful as they are in preparing men's minds for a change, must fail to complete their object without the aid of the temporal power" (*Tierney*, vol. iii. p. xlix).

[4] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 249, No. 12.

proven." But that he was the centre of all the plots agains her Crown is incontestable.

Elizabeth saw plainly the influence of Parsons in thes frequent attacks which menaced her throne. In a Proclama tion, dated October 1591, entitled, "A Declaration of grea troubles pretended against the realm by a number of seminar priests and Jesuits sent and very secretly dispersed into th same to work great treason under a false pretence of religio with a provision very necessary for the remedy thereof,"[1] th penal laws were increased; and the attempts of the King o Spain are attributed to "the special information of a schoo man arrogating to himself the name of the King Catholic confessor." Parsons could not stand this. He answered th Proclamation by a book, the well-known *Elizabethae Anglic reginae haeresim Calvinianam propugnantis saevissimum Catholicos sui regni Edictum . . . by D. Andreas Philopatru* (1592), in which he discusses and refutes it paragraph b paragraph. There are two passages which are of interest t us at present. About himself he says: "Concerning Parson she indeed asserts (it is more ridiculous than unpleasant) tha he assume to himself that he is the confessor of the Kin Catholic. But who will think this conviction either true o probable who knows the man, the post, or the place? For a far as I judge, Parsons neither lives in court, nor if he live there, is a man fit in any way for the weight of such a heav burthen; for besides many other things necessary for this pos a great knowledge and experience of Spanish affairs is neede and intimate acquaintance with the language is require Why, therefore, does the Proclamation pour forth such absur stupid, and improbable statements?"[2] He adds, a little lat on, he would rather be Elizabeth's confessor than the King's But the book is more valuable for the distinct assertio Parsons makes about the papal power in matters temporal, a opinion which was to be in the next reign the cause of muc suffering. It will be noticed that he calls it a doctrine faith; which it certainly was not. "The universal school Catholic theologians and canonists hold (and it is certain an of faith) that any Christian prince who manifestly swerv

[1] Strypes, *Annals*, iv. p. 78. [2] P. 361. [3] P. 374.

from the Catholic religion, and wishes to call others from it, falls at once from all power and dignity, both by divine and human right, and before any sentence be passed against him by the supreme pastor and judge; and his subjects are free from the obligation of any oath of allegiance which they had taken to him as a legitimate prince; they may and should (if they have power) expel from his sovereignty over Christians such a man as an apostate, a heretic, a deserter of Christ the Lord, and an enemy hostile to the state itself, lest he infect others, and withdraw them from the faith by his example and commandment. Now this, the certain, defined, and undoubted opinion of the most learned, is clearly conformable and in agreement with the apostolic doctrine." And he proceeds to quote St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii., concerning the faithful wife who is bound to the unbelieving husband.

It will be well to note this assertion of Parsons when it was a matter of justifying his rebellion against Elizabeth. But he had no such scruple when it came to the question of obtaining the favour of James I. Neither did all the Jesuits in England share his views, as can be seen from the "Supplication" of Father Robert Southwell in 1595, wherein he styles the Queen "most mighty, most merciful, most feared and best beloved Princess . . . the only and sheet anchor of our just hope"; and assures her that "the sacred name of our most noble Queen" is such that "next to God's word" it is to "be honoured among the most impregnable testimonies of the truth."[1]

In June 1593 Parsons went to Madrid to secure his work of the seminaries. Walpole tells us that "he writes infinite letters weekly to those he depends upon for their maintenance; he has great favour with the King, and all the Court, and throughout Spain, as also in Italy and Flanders."[2] But Parsons, by this time, saw there was but little chance of an expedition starting now, or, while Elizabeth was alive, of its success if it did start. He was devoting himself to preparing a grand effort to secure a Catholic succession. Now at last, entirely rejecting the Scotch King, he fixed his hopes on the

[1] *Archpriest Controversy*, ii. p. 97. [2] *A Supplication to Her Majesty*, p. 52.

Infanta.[1] The memorial on the Succession he had presented to the King a few years before was enlarged into a book, *A Conference on the Succession*, in which he lays down propositions some of which were startling by their novelty in those days that the people have the right to elect their governor,[2] who is in turn responsible to his people for good government, and if he fails can be rejected by them. Another proposition bearing on the case is, that the religion of the claimant to the throne is of more importance to the people than his right.[3]

After an exhaustive study of the pretensions of the various claimants to the English Crown, he rejects them all except the Infanta, and puts her forward as one who unites the best right to the fact of being a Catholic. The book is a direct appeal to the people, who in their own time answered in their own way. Its principles found the legitimate result in the execution of Charles I. It is another indication of the Puritan cast of mind which forms so important an element in Parsons' character.[4] The *Book of the Succession* made a great sensation

[1] From Fr. Henry Walpole's confession: "Those who wish for violence desire the Spaniards. They think when the Queen is dead there will be a division in the Catholic religion. Fr. Parsons wishes the Catholics to keep themselves quiet, and take no part until some one is declared; and then to offer their services to him who request of use of their religion . . . Thinks the invasion of the Spaniards would prejudice both the commonwealth and the Catholic religion; would defend the realm and conform to the laws as a true Englishman and subject of Her Majesty" (S. P. Dom. Eliz. vol. 249, No. 44).

[2] Ranke (*op. cit.* p. 92) remarks that the Jesuit doctrine of the sovereignty of the people and the opinions they held as to regicide were the causes of their ruin in France; while their tenets respecting free will and their theological quarrel with the Dominicans had produced the injury they suffered in Spain.

[3] Parsons' attitude can be partly gathered from a letter he wrote from Madrid (8th September 1595) to Standen: "But howsoever these matters of title go, which God only must determine, my conclusion shall be to your whole letter, that among such variety and perplexity of pretenders as now aim for that Crown, it is enough for a Catholic sober man to have any prince, admitted by the body of his realm, and allowed by the authority of God's Catholic Church, and that will defend the religion of his old noble ancestors; and without this nothing is sufficient, nor should any reason in this world move us to yield him favour or obedience, though he were our father, son, or brother" (*Records of the English Catholics*, vol. ii. pp. 283, 284).

[4] The substance of the first part of this book was reprinted by the Puritans with parliamentary licence as "Several Speeches delivered at a Conference concerning the Power of Parliament to proceed against their King for Misgovernment." It appeared again as "The Broken Succession of the Crown of England," when Cromwell

in England. An Act of Parliament made it treason to have a copy. By Parsons' friends it was received as a masterpiece of convincing logic. He caused it to be read in the refectory at the seminaries, to imbue the students with its ideas; and this was greatly resented. Among Parsons' opponents on the Continent the book was received with much indignation.[1]

This book on the Succession was published in 1594. It is worth remarking that it was brought out, notwithstanding a formal and stringent order issued the previous year by the very highest authority in the Society. There had been growing among the professed fathers a feeling of distrust at the political dealings of some of their members. Scandals were arising and schisms breaking out. In the fifth General Congregation, which sat from November 1593 to January 1594, it was decreed: In order as far as possible to keep from all appearances of evil and from disputes, even such as arise from false suspicions, by the present decree it is gravely prescribed to all of ours, in virtue of holy obedience and under penalty of inability for any office and dignity or superiority, and of loss of both active and passive voice, that no one should under any pretext mix himself up in the public and worldly affairs of princes, such as are said to be pertaining to affairs of state; neither let any, at the request or requirement of any, dare or presume to undertake the management of political affairs of this kind. It is seriously commended to superiors that they do not allow ours to be mixed up in any way in such matters, and if they see some to be inclined that way they should remove them from the locality as soon as possible, if there be occasion of danger of their being involved in such complications.[2] Had such legislation as this decree and others of the same Congregation been loyally carried out, the good name

aiming at power. And once more, in 1681, when the Bill for excluding James II. was before Parliament.

[1] The amiable F. Jouvency, S.J., in his *Historia Societatis Jesu*, would not believe that the book was Parsons': "Minime omnium quidem certe Personio conveniebat qui tam lubricum et invidiosum tractare argumentum homo sapiens et consideratus noluisset; nec attigere ausus esset vetitum nostris legibus in Congregatione Generali quinta confirmata" (p. 138). We, however, are in a position to know Parsons better than did Jouvency.

[2] *Institutum Soc. Jes.* (ed. 1757), vol. i. pp. 555 and 565.

of the Society would not have been endangered by th disobediences of a few. This Congregation had been force upon Aquaviva by the Spanish Jesuits, who found in the ne Pope, Clement VIII. (1590–1605), and the renowned Jesui F. Toledo (made Cardinal in 1593), men more or less favourabl to the limitations sought to be imposed upon the authorit of the General. But having, with the help of the Frenc German, and Italian representatives, triumphed over th Spanish fathers, Aquaviva appears to have used his dispensin power, and while allowing Parsons to continue his course a political agitator, was thus able to show the practical superiorit of the General over the legislative Congregation.

Upon Allen's death a vigorous attempt was made t procure Parsons' elevation to the cardinalate; and petition from his friends went up to the Holy See to forward his caus

And how did Parsons take this attempt to "empurpurate him? Bound by his vow not to seek directly or indirectl after ecclesiastical honours, he kept it faithfully. If the visio of the scarlet hat was tempting, Parsons knew it meant betrayal of the Society[1] which must keep a firm han upon all Jesuits. He had no desire to be served in the sam way as Allen. His promotion would mean his removal and removal, just at that time, when the mastery of the Clerg was falling into his hands. It would also be the overthro of all his plans. There probably was an internal struggl Once a Cardinal, he would be more out of reach of the sting of his opponents, which must have been, even to a man of iro will, most distressing. And what could he not do, were h Pope? A letter received from the Provincial in Flande (24th November 1594) pointed out to him how such a appointment would interfere with his work, and urgent implored him to act generously in the matter. It took son little time for him to make up his mind to act on the advic He was taken ill. It was not till 20th February 1595 th he sent on the letter to Aquaviva, and expresses how much is in agreement with the views of the Provincial: "I fe within me no appetite or inclination, neither have I t

[1] Toledo was sometimes called an "apostate," because he took the side of students in Rome against their superiors.

SOCIETATIS FUNCTIONES

strength to fulfil the duties."[1] This is probably perfectly true. In Parsons' character there was no self-seeking. He was absorbed in the one passion of his life, the advancement of his Society. There was no room for any other ambition. By 10th May he had fully made up his mind not to accept the dignity, and writes a very clear and explicit letter to Sir Francis Englefield on the subject.[2] Later on (18th May 1597) he could write about an attempt his friends were then making: "I do not agree with the Memorial that, things being as they are, the general remedy is to press for an English Cardinal. . . . It seems at present that the English nation has no man sufficient for this dignity, according to the judgment and taste of all; and thus there appears to be less defect and inconvenience in having none than an unfit one."[3]

Parsons, during this period, began to put into order and add to certain notes he had begun seventeen or eighteen years ago, upon the reformation of England which was to take place when a Catholic King should succeed Elizabeth. Ill health had for some time been pressing upon him, and he feared he might not live to see the "golden day." It was well to have, therefore, all his plans drawn out in black and white. The gist of this *Memorial for the Reformation of England* is, that first and foremost all the abbey lands secured by Henry VIII. were to be restored, according to the decree of Paul IV., which seems to revoke the declaration of his predecessor, that the holders might retain possession. These lands, etc., however, were not to be restored to the original owners,[4] but to a Council of "principal bishops and prelates and others most fit for the purpose," which should have full control over all ecclesiastical funds, and dispose of them as was considered best for the restoration of the Church. "It were not convenient to return these lands and livings again to the said orders of religion that had them before . . . (but rather to) good

[1] More, p. 231.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 232–234.

[3] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. i. p. 394.

[4] This attitude to the question of monastic property does not seem to have been peculiar to Parsons. Twenty years after his death the matter arose in parts of Germany. Ranke says (*op. cit.* p. 278): "It would be difficult to describe the commotion that ensued among the Clergy on perceiving that the Jesuits proposed to constitute themselves possessors of the recovered monastic property. The Society of

colleges, universities, seminaries, schools for increasing ou Clergy, as also divers houses of other orders that do deal mor in preaching and helping of souls, etc." [1] In other words, a the Jesuits were to have the glory of re-converting England they should take possession of the property which belonge to the former apostles of the country. This Council o reformation was to be concerned, not only in ecclesiastica matters, but in matters purely secular. It was to be, in fac the Inquisition, though not in name, as that "may be somewha odious and offending at the beginning." [2] The whole book is curious picture of what England would have been had Parson had his way. The history of Poland would have had it counterpart in this country.[3] How this "Memorial" worke ninety years after in the reign of James II. will be seen later o

While thus day-dreaming Parsons was suddenly aroused b an attack upon the position he had laboured so carefully t secure. And this time the danger came, not from the Englis Government, but from English Clergy and laity, who woul not have that man to rule over them.

Jesus was reported to have declared that there were now no Benedictines remainin that all had departed from the rule of their founder, and were no more capable resuming their lost possession. [The Nuncio says: 'It is perfectly true that t Jesuit Fathers have sought and do seek by favour of the Emperor which could not well greater, not only to obtain a preference over all the other orders, but even exclude all others wherever they have any interest, either political or ecclesiastical . . . . An edict published in Rome, July 1629, allowed that a portion of the recover property might go to founding schools, seminaries, and colleges, as well as to t Jesuits, who had been the chief promoters of the restoration."

[1] Pp. 55–57.

[2] Pp. 70, 71. Among the State Papers (S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 261, No. 9 are some extracts in Latin from the "Memorial" signed by Parsons, with a note to t effect, "that most of the English nobles possess property of religious orders and ne a dispensation for its retention, which is granted by Jesuits only, and therefore th prevail, and secular priests are not admitted into their houses."

[3] For an interesting and clear account of a part of Jesuit history about which lit is known, see *The Jesuits in Poland*, by A. F. Pollard (1892).

CHAPTER VII

BROILS IN ENGLAND, ROME, AND FLANDERS

LEAVING Parsons for a while doing Philip's work, we must go back to England and view the labours of the Jesuits as Missioners. Jasper Heywood and William Holt arrived in the summer of 1581. They laboured at first in Staffordshire, where, it is said, they converted within three months over two hundred persons.[1] When Parsons fled out of England, Heywood became Superior of the English Mission; while Holt was sent to James VI. in Scotland.[2] Heywood quickly took upon himself to direct the Clergy, and for this purpose summoned a meeting in Norfolk. One of the subjects he had at heart was the question whether the old traditional days of fasting and other practices were to be observed; or whether the customs learnt at Rome were to prevail. The reader will remember that Parsons, on arrival in England, had been met with the same question; for the seminary priests, educated abroad, had tried to introduce the new customs. It had been decided at the Synod held in Southwark that the *status quo* was to be preserved. The Marian Clergy, besides clinging to the old English traditions, felt that now, more than ever, it was necessary to preserve the earnest and fervent spirit of their people and not give way to relaxations at a moment when, on all sides, the Church's precepts were being despised. This, however, did not suit Heywood. Himself an invalid, he could neither fast nor abstain. So he determined to introduce

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 155, No. 96.

[2] While in Scotland he was arrested at Leith early in 1583. The English Government insisting upon him being delivered into their hands, the French Ambassador opposed this; and by the August 1584 he was set at liberty and banished. He went to Rome in 1586, and on 24th October became Rector of the English college, and two years after was sent to Brussels as Parsons' agent at that Court.

the mitigation. At the meeting in Norfolk, "Master Doleman being present required of Fr. Heywood to see his commission who being unable to show him any, he, the said Maste Doleman, did inhibit him to proceed any further."[2] Bu Heywood was not to be put down. What was one of th old Clergy to the Superior of the Mission? He passed decree which abolished the old Friday fast, certain vigils, the Lente fast and the Rogation-days. He desired that the ol Liturgical "uses" should be given up in favour of the Roman and concluded with the words: "Lastly, if any man, in an of all these points, have any doubts of conscience, let hi know that they be all set down by authority of them that ma dispense in all customs or laws to the contrary, etc."[3]

Catholics began to murmur; and the state which Heywoo kept up caused much scandal. "His port and carriage wa more baronlike than priestlike. . . . Was he not wont t ride up and down the country in his coach? Had he n both servants and priests attendants that did hang on h sleeves in great numbers? . . . Was not his pomp such a the places where he came seemed petty courts by his presenc his train and followers?"[4] By his laxity he gave gre scandal even to Protestants.

Foley relates the following:—"He happened to be London staying at the house of a gentleman to which he wa in the habit of resorting. His host was a schismatic, thoug not far removed from the Catholic faith, and benevolent to th priests for the sake of his Catholic wife. Fr. Heywood, on accou of his severe suffering from the gout, was himself necessari dispensed from fasting. It happened to be the time of th rogation-days, and the table was prepared with both kinds food, there being at the time several other priests and Catholi visiting at the house. Some, with Fr. Heywood and the gentl man of the house, used meat, it being no fasting-day according the Roman rite. This brought on a discussion regarding th diversity of practice. Fr. Heywood, himself an eminent the

[1] One of the Marian priests.
[2] *A Sparing Discoverie of our English Jesuits*, p. 48.
[3] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. i. p. 354.
[4] *A Reply to Fr. Parsons' Libel*, p. 14.

logian, adduced many theologians on his side; and by the difference of opinion and practice thus evidenced, he so mortally offended his host, that from being a friend of Fr. Heywood, he became his enemy. Going out therefore into the market-place, he purchased a copy of a recent Government proclamation, ordering all priests and Jesuits to leave the realm within a given day, under extreme penalties, and likewise denouncing all who harboured them. Returning to the house, he asked Fr. Heywood if that paper personally affected him? 'Certainly it does,' replied the father, 'but I am safe under your roof.' 'Indeed!' he answered; 'but I have never promised you this security: neither is your style of living or mode of thinking so agreeable to me that I would wish to lose my head and my fortune for your sake. Therefore, from this time, consider yourself as my prisoner.' He was about to leave for the purpose of denouncing Fr. Heywood to the Privy Council, but the earnest entreaties and tears of his wife, backed by a gift of money, prevailed to stop him. He turned, however, the father out of doors. 'So much need is there to take heed as to where, and under whose eyes, you use the liberty allowed you,' adds Father More."[1]

These complaints reaching Parsons, and at the same time messengers being sent by some Catholics to Allen, praying for the recall of Heywood, the General ordered him to leave England. He was summoned by Parsons to repair to Paris to give an account of himself; but on the way, falling into the hands of the Government, he was committed to the Clink, 9th December 1583. For seventeen months he was imprisoned; and at last [21st January 1585] was put on board a vessel and landed on the coast of Normandy, with the threat of death if he returned. And so Jasper Heywood passes from our view.

He was succeeded as Superior by William Weston[2] [September 1584]. During the short time this father was at liberty he became famous as the leader in a series of exorcisms which created a stir in the country, and which brought in a number of converts. He is the reputed author of *The Book of Miracles*, a work now lost, but extracts of which are preserved

[1] Foley, i. pp. 395, 396.

[2] Known under the *aliases* of Edmunds and Hunt.

in a rare book called "*A Declaration of egregious Popish im postures, to withdraw the hearts of Her Majesty's subjects fron their allegiance, and from the truth of Christian Religion pro fessed in England, under the pretence of casting out devils Practised by Edmunds alias Weston, a Jesuit, and divers Romis priests his wicked associates. Whereunto are annexed th copies of the Confessions and examinations of the parties them selves, which were pretended to be possessed and dispossessed taken upon oath before Her Majesty's Commissioners for cause ecclesiastical*" [1603]. The author of this book, which is choice specimen of invective, was Dr. Harsnett, chaplain t the Bishop of London, and afterwards Archbishop of York He published his book by order of the Privy Council.

Shortly before Weston came to England there was one o those strange outbreaks which have not been unfrequent i France. Besides a series at Laon in 1566, there had bee some manifestations at Soissons in 1582, and while the excite ment was at its height, fifteen of the seminarists from Rheim were in that city for ordinations. When the manifestation began in England, Weston superintended them, and wa assisted by twelve priests, seminarists all of them, among whon were the names of Dryland, Cornelius Sherwood, Dibdale Ballard,[1] Thules,[2] and Anthony Tyrell.[3] The exorcisms tool place in public in the houses of noblemen and other well-know men, such as at Lord Vaux's at Hackney, the Earl of Lincoln' in Cannon Row, Mr. Gardiner's house at Fulmer, Mr. Hughes at Uxbridge, and at Sir George Peckham's at Denham in Bucks The sufferers were Marwood, servant to Anthony Babington Trayford, Sarah and Friswood Williams, and Anne Smith servants to Edmund Peckham, son of Sir George, and on Robert Magnie, a connection of Peckham's. These unfortunate were taken about the country, and exorcisms were performed i various places. The *modus operandi* was peculiar. The patien was set in a chair and made to swallow a "holy potion" com posed of sack, salad oil, drugs and rue (about a pint); th

[1] Executed for the Babington Plot [8th October 1586].

[2] Afterwards one of the anti-Weston party at Wisbeach.

[3] He spent his time apparently between the two camps. Parsons wrote his life so that, among other reasons, posterity "may truly know what passed with us i these our days of new reformation."

head was then held over a dish of burning sulphur, asafœtida, galbanum, St. John's wort and rue. Half-stifled and intoxicated, the exorcisms began. In Weston's own account of an exorcism of Marwood, he says that he placed his hand on the demoniac's head, who at once fell into a fury, and made all to ring with crying, swearing, and blaspheming. "Take away that dreadful hand in the name of all the devils in hell," was the agonising cry. But the father would not quit his hold. He pursued the devil down his back, his reins, his close parts, his thighs, his legs, *usque ad talos*, and down to his ankle-bones; then fetching him back along the same route, finally grasped him round the neck. "*Deus immortalis*! what a passion was he then cast. Not the tongues of 1000 men (I imagine) can express it."[1] Relics when applied were known and described; especial reverence was shown, of course, to those of Campion; nails, lumps of lead, knives came from their bodies; and under the exorcisms the truth of the Catholic Faith was asserted.

The names of the devils said to possess the sufferers were: Frateretto, Fliberdigibet, Hoberdicat, Cocobatto, Pudding of Thame, Hobberdidance, Lusty Dick, Kellico, Hob, Cornercap, Puff and Purr ("two fat devils"), Kellicorum, Wilkin, Lusty Jolly Jenkins, Bonjour, Pourdieu, Motubizant, Captain Pippin, Captain Fillpot, Hilco, Hiaclito, Smolkin, Lusty Huffcap, Modo, and Malin.[2] When these disappeared it is said that Hobberdidance went off in a whirlwind, Fillpot as a puff of smoke, Lusty Dick as an intolerable stench, while Smolkin escaped from Trayford's ear as a mouse.

The report of these doings, while giving great confidence to the friends of the Jesuits,[3] alarmed the older Clergy, who were greatly grieved at the introduction of these "foreign devices"

[1] Harsnett, p. 76.

[2] Shakespeare borrowed from Harsnett the names of the devils in King Lear, and also some of the circumstances of the possessions. See Act III. scene iv.; Act IV. scene i.

[3] "Array, Parsons' ape, a runnagate priest and notable Polypragmon here in our state, meets with Ma. Tyrell, newly come from beyond the seas, and vaunts with a big look that Fa. Weston had shown such a sovering authority over hell, as the devils themselves should confess their kingdom was near to an end. And the same Array was so full fraught with hope and confidence in the Spanish and Guisan attempts then in hand, his first congé was in Master Tyrell's ear, at their entering into Paul's, bidding him be of good cheer for that all things now went very well forward" (Harsnett, p. 7).

by their younger brethren, saying that "however they might be admired for the moment they would in the end mar all and utterly discredit both themselves and their calling."[1]

These manifestations went on for about eighteen months and from the October 1585 to June 1586 were of almost daily occurrence. The imprisonment of Ballard and Weston however, effectually put an end to them.

What are we to think of these manifestations? While admitting the possibility of possession (serious scientists are now allowing that one intelligence can act upon another) experience points out that the proper attitude in such cases is at least a suspension of assent. The morbid craving for notoriety, the childish satisfaction of duping others are well-known states; these together with the phenomena of nervous (hysteria, hystero-epilepsy) diseases will make anyone, nowadays pause before assenting to the introduction of the supernatural into individual cases. Besides, as has been wittily said "Historians have never made sufficient allowances for the deliberate lying of witnesses incapable of deception."

At an early date in the proceedings Tyrell says he had misgivings as to the reality of the cases. He communicated his doubts to two other exorcists, one of whom exhorted him to a "goodly credulity," and the other insisted "that they were of such importance as would farther the Catholic cause more than all the books that had been written of late years about the controversies of Religion with the Protestants."[2]

In the sworn confessions of the possessed (Marwood and Trayford had disappeared) open avowal was made that they had vied with one another in the extravagances of their tricks and pretences. As to the knowledge of the relics, one says "She and the rest did know all these relics, having the sight of them almost every day, and hearing the priests tell of whom they were. So that as soon as this examinate saw any of them, she could name them very readily, and say, This is such a piece of Fr. Campion, etc."

That Weston was a wilful deceiver cannot be for a moment

[1] "Devil-hunting in Elizabethan England," by T. G. Law, *Nineteenth Century Magazine*, March 1894.

[2] Harsnett, p. 251.

entertained. But he seems to have had even more than his full share of "goodly credulity"; and, being somewhat hysterical, was easily made a dupe of by others.[1]

In the July of 1586 the number of Jesuits in England was increased by the arrival of two famous men: Henry Garnett and Robert Southwell, men of the types of Parsons and Campion respectively. Of Henry Garnett, whose name will frequently appear in these pages, we may quote Foley (on More), who eulogises him in these terms: "He so combined the arduous duties of a laborious missioner and an admirable superior as to secure the veneration of his brothers in religion, the love of externs and the esteem of all, being possessed of the keenest intelligence, a sharp and solid judgment, an extensive knowledge of affairs, readiness in counsel, and, what is rarely found combined with these gifts, simplicity, candour, and a most confiding heart. To these he added a wonderful moderation and gentleness, approaching to exemption from all feelings of perturbation; his manner was easy, his countenance pleasant and modest. He was besides a man of brilliant genius and learning, well versed in the arts and sciences, and a famous linguist."[2] Foley is nothing if not eulogistic. Whether the reader will altogether agree with this estimate of Garnett's character will depend mainly upon the view he takes as the history of the man unfolds itself. We get an interesting glimpse of the times in the missionary life of these two fathers. Garnett and Southwell frequented the house of one Bold or Bolt in Berkshire, where, according to Weston's autobiography, "there was a chapel, an organ likewise, and other musical instruments, and, moreover, singers of both sexes belonging to the family, the master of the house being singularly experienced in the art. There during the course of those days we celebrated, as it were, a long octave of some magnificent festival." At Bold's house the Jesuits met the famous Dr. Byrd, the musician, who, for the sake of his religion, had sacri-

[1] Recent events in France have shown how easily duped pious persons are with any account of supernatural dealings. The infamous hoax practised by Leo Taxil with his *Diable au dix-neuvième Siècle* and Diana Vaughan is a case very much to the purpose.

[2] *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, vol. iv. p. 39.

ficed his position in Elizabeth's Chapel Royal. It was very likely that this prince of English musicians wrote his three most exquisite masses for the use of this musical family. Strange even in the days when saying mass was high treason, that Catholics managed to celebrate in secret the rites of their religion with something of the old splendour.

These two Jesuits were followed in 1588 by John Gerard and Edward Oldcorne. Meanwhile Garnett had succeeded Weston as Superior.

There were now five in England, but one of them (Weston) was in prison. Gerard was a remarkably active man, and did much for the increase of the Society. While Garnet remained more or less hidden, so as to direct the movements of his men, Gerard, who seems to have acted as a kind of vice-superior, went up and down the country, hearing confessions, reconciling converts, and giving the "Spiritual Exercises." He was also a great collector of money for the Society, and was remarkably successful. In his autobiography we get such entries as these: "I also received many general confessions; among others that of a widow lady of high rank, who for the rest of her days applied herself to good works and gave me an annual sum of 1000 florins for the Society; another widow[2] gave 700."[3] "I also gave a retreat to two fine young men who were brothers, who both came to the resolution of entering the Society. . . . Before his departure (*the elder*) among other alms-deeds he gave to the Society from 11,000 to 12,000 florins." "My host [Henry Drury] bestowed nearly one half of his goods upon the Society."

Such success was sure to excite jealousy, and it was put down to the influence obtained by giving the "Exercises." Upon this point the late Fr. John Morris, S.J., remarks: "Fr. Gerard would not have denied the power of the "Exercises" to induce the resolution to 'make friends of the mammon of iniquity'; but this, as all who have followed the "Exercises of St. Ignatius" know by experience, is only because the eternal truths assert themselves with unparalleled force in the meditations of the "Exercises." On the subject of alms-giving

[1] Probably Lady Lovel. [2] Mrs. Fortescue.

[3] *The Life of Fr. John Gerard* (1881), pp. 63; 70–72.

St. Ignatius proposes three rules, and they are characteristically sober: 'Do as you would advise a stranger to do for the greater glory of God; observe the form and measure of your alms that you would wish you had observed when you come to die; take that Rule which at the Day of Judgment you would wish you had taken.'"[1] We may remark had Fr. Gerard shown a higher spirit of disinterestedness and refused to accept for the Society what was offered under the influence or stimulation of the "Exercises," it would have been better in every way.

His life reads almost like a romance. Carrying his life in his hand, he was able by various disguises, by ready wit and presence of mind, to escape the pursuivants over and over again. Garnett was obliged to keep two or three houses always ready where his subjects might find him for advice, the manifestation of Conscience, the retreats and renewal of vows prescribed by the Rule. At one of these meetings, the Jesuits were nearly taken. Gerard thus recounts the circumstances: "On one occasion[2] we were all met together in the Superior's house, while he yet resided in the country, and were employed in the renovation of spirit. We had had several conferences, and the Superior had given each of us some advice in private, when the question was started, what should we do if the priest-hunters came suddenly upon us, seeing that there were so many of us and there was nothing like hiding-places enough for us all. We numbered then, I think, nine or ten of ours, besides other priests, our friends, and some Catholics who would also have had to seek concealment. The blessed Father Garnett answered: 'True, we ought not all to meet together, now that our number is daily increasing; however, as we are here assembled for the greater glory of God, I will be answerable for all till the renovation is over, but beyond that I will not promise.' Accordingly on the very day of the renovation, though he had been quite unconcerned before, he earnestly warned every one to look to himself and not to tarry beyond necessity, adding: 'I do not guarantee your safety any longer.' Some hearing this mounted their horses after dinner and rode off. Five of ours and two secular priests stayed behind.

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 65, 66. [2] 18th October 1591; *Ibid.* p. 108.

Next morning about five o'clock, when Fr. Southwell wa beginning mass and the others and myself were at meditatio I heard a bustle at the house door, and directly after crie and oaths poured forth against the servant for refusin admittance. The fact was that four priest-hunters c pursuivants, as they are called, with drawn swords, were tryin to break down the doors and force an entrance. The faithfu servant withstood them, otherwise we should have been a made prisoners.[1] But by this time Fr. Southwell had hear the uproar, and guessing what it meant, had at once taken o his vestments and stripped the altar, while we strove t seek out everything belonging to us, so that there might b nothing found to betray the presence of a priest. We did nc even wish to leave boots and swords lying about, which woul serve to show there had been many guests, though none c them appeared. Hence many of us were anxious about ou beds, which were still warm and only covered, according t custom, previous to being made. Some therefore went an turned their beds so that the colder part might deceiv anybody who put his hand in to feel. Thus, while the enem was shouting and bawling outside and our servants wer keeping the door; saying that the mistress of the house, widow, had not yet got up, but that she was coming directl and would give them an answer; we profited by the delay t store away ourselves and all our baggage in a cleverl contrived hiding-place. At last these four leopards were l in. They raged about the house, looking everywhere an prying into the darkest corners with candles. They took fou hours over the business, but failed in their search, and onl brought out the forbearance of the Catholics in sufferin and their own spite and obstinacy in seeking. At last the took themselves off, after getting paid, forsooth, for the trouble."[2]

In 1594 Gerard was seized and confined in the Counte "a very evil prison and without comfort," says Garnett. Her he says, "I was lodged in a garret where there was nothir

[1] The Jesuits who escaped were Garnett, Gerard, Oldcorne, Southwell, a Stanney.

[2] The scene of this adventure was probably at Lord Vaux's, Harrowden.

but a bed, and no room to stand upright, except just where the bed was. There was one window always open, day and night, through which the foul air entered and the rain fell on to my bed. The room door was so low that I had to enter, not on my feet, but on my knees, and even then I was forced to stoop. However, I reckoned this rather an advantage, inasmuch as it helped to keep out the stench (certainly no small one) that came from the privy close to my door, that was used by all the prisoners in that part of the house. I was often kept awake, or waked up, by the bad smell." [1]

He was taken from the Counter to the Clink, a prison adjoining the Bishop of Winchester's palace in Southwark. Here the "mammon of iniquity" served him. By bribes he was able to secure a large amount of liberty within the prison, and, through the connivance of his keeper, fitted up one room as a chapel where he used to gather together the Catholic prisoners and administer the consolations of religion. He even gave the "Exercises" to many. As it was now an open fact that he was a Jesuit, Gerard no longer tried to disguise it, but wore openly his religious habit both in the prison and in the streets of London when being taken to and fro for examinations. On one of these occasions, when at the Guildhall, he tells of a conversation which shows what reliance can be put upon some of the protestations of allegiance. "They asked me whether I acknowledged the Queen as the true Governor and Queen of England. I answered: 'I do acknowledge her as such.' 'What,' said Topcliffe, 'in spite of Pius v.'s excommunication?' I answered: 'I acknowledge her as our Queen, notwithstanding I know there is such excommunication.' He adds naïvely: 'The fact was I knew that the operation of that excommunication had been suspended for all England by a declaration of the pontiff till such time as its execution became possible.'" [2]

Imprisonment did not hinder Gerard's activity; he even cleverly turned it to advantage. "As my abode was fixed and easy to find, the greater part of the priests that were sent from the seminaries abroad had instructions to apply to me

[1] *Ibid.* p. 187. [2] *Ibid.* p. 225.

that through me they might be introduced to their Superior,[1] and might receive other assistance at my hands. Not having always places prepared nor houses of Catholics to which I could send them, I rented a house and garden in a suitable spot and furnished it, as far as was wanted, by the help of my friends. Thither I used to send those who brought letters of recommendation from our fathers and who I was assured led a holy life and seemed well fitted for the Mission. I maintained them there till I had supplied them, through the aid of certain friends, with clothes and necessaries, sometimes even with a residence or with a horse to go to their friends and kinsmen in the country. I covered all the expenses of this house with the alms that were bestowed upon me. I did not receive alms from many persons, still less from all that came to see me; indeed, both out of prison and in prison I often refused such offers." [2]

On 14th April 1597 he underwent torture in the Tower and gives us the following graphic account of what took place. One must admire his constancy under such barbarous treatment. Having refused to reply to certain questions, he was delivered over to the executioners:—

"Then we proceeded to the place appointed for torture. We went in a sort of solemn procession, the attendants preceding us with lighted candles, because the place was underground and very dark, especially about the entrance. It was a place of immense extent, and in it were ranged divers sorts of racks and other instruments of torture. Some of these they displayed before me, and told me I should have to taste them every one. Then again they asked me if I was willing to satisfy them on the points on which they had questioned me. 'It is out of my power to satisfy you,' I answered; and throwing myself on my knees, I said a prayer or two.

"Then they led me to a great upright beam or pillar of wood which was one of the supports of this vast crypt. At the summit of this column were fixed certain iron staples for

[1] At this date the secular priests had no Superior at all. Garnett acted as "Superior of the Mission," but with no authority from the Holy See.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 203.

supporting weights. Here they placed on my wrists gauntlets of iron, and ordered me to mount upon two or three wicker steps, then raising my arms they inserted an iron bar through the rings of the gauntlets, and then through the staples to the pillar, putting a pin through the bar so that it could not slip. My arms being thus fixed above my head, they withdrew these wicker steps I spoke of, one by one, from beneath my feet, so that I hung by my hands and arms. The tips of my toes, however, still touched the ground, so they dug away the ground beneath; for they could not raise me higher, as they had suspended me from the topmost staples in the pillar.

"Thus hanging by my wrists I began to pray, while those gentlemen standing round asked me again if I was willing to confess. I replied, 'I neither can nor will'; but so terrible a pain began to oppress me that I was scarce able to speak the words. The worst pain was in my breast and belly, my arms and hands. It seemed to me that all the blood in my body rushed up my arms into my hands; and I was under the impression at the time that the blood actually burst forth from my fingers at the back of my hands. This was, however, a mistake; the sensation was caused by the swelling of the flesh over the iron that bound it. I felt now such intense pain (and the effect was probably heightened by an interior temptation) that it seemed to me impossible to continue enduring it. It did not, however, go so far as to make me feel any inclination or real disposition to give the information they wanted. . . .

"Hereupon those gentlemen, seeing that I gave them no further answer, departed to the Lieutenant's house, and there they waited, sending now and then to know how things were going on in the crypt. There were left with me three or four strong men to superintend my torture. My gaoler also remained, I fully believe out of kindness to me, and kept wiping away with a handkerchief the sweat that ran down from my face the whole time, as indeed it did from my whole body. . . .

"I had hung in that way till after one of the clock, as I think, when I fainted. How long I was in that faint I know not—perhaps not long; for the men who stood by lifted me up

or replaced those wicker steps under my feet, until I came to myself; and immediately they heard me praying they let me down again. This they did over and over again when the faint came on, eight or nine times before five of the clock."[1]

By the help of some faithful lay-brothers Gerard managed to escape from the Tower in 1597. Two of them, accompanied by one of his former keepers, stole one night in a boat to the Tower, and fastening a rope to the trunk of a tree, on the other side of the moat, afforded him a means of escape. Gerard resumed his old life in the country, and visited London from time to time, where he kept part of a house for the purpose of giving the "Exercises" to persons of rank. He remained in England unmolested, in spite of the frequent searches.

Robert Southwell calls for a word of notice. If less romantic than Gerard's life, Southwell's appeals to the higher feelings as a brave man who sealed his convictions with his blood. During his short course he lived mostly with the Countess of Arundel. Unlike Heywood and others, "he did not adopt the extravagant disguises which many priests of that day thought it necessary to affect, attiring themselves as gallants with feathers in their caps and hawks on their fists, with slashed satin doublets and velvet cloaks, mounted on good horses with lackeys running by their side. On the contrary, he was wont to be apparelled in 'black rashe' with clothes 'more fit than fine,' as he sings of himself—a man not very remarkable, of moderate stature, with auburn hair and beard."[2] His life was a very solitary one, varied only with secret visits to the neighbouring Catholics and journeys to London. But besides his devotional duties he found relaxation in composing those beautiful verses which give his name an honoured place among English poets. For six years he laboured on quietly, until in 1592 he was betrayed by a daughter of his host, Richard Bellamy of Uxenden Hall. Anne had been instructed by him if she were asked, Was Robert Southwell at her father's house? to swear no: with the reservation to herself that he was not there so that she was bound to tell them. This was defended at his trial on

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 240–243. [2] Foley, i. p. 332.

the ground "that no man is bound to answer every man that asketh him unless he were a competent judge."[1] Whether the Jesuits considered Elizabeth's judges competent *rebus sic stantibus* is perhaps open to question.

Anne Bellamy did not, however, learn her lesson thoroughly. Being taken on 26th January 1592, she was committed to the Gatehouse as an obstinate recusant. Here she fell under the power of the infamous Topcliffe, who is said to have seduced her.[2] She consented to betray Southwell the next time she learnt he was at her father's. On 5th July 1592 he was captured and taken by Topcliffe to his own house in Westminster, where, as it appears with the Council's permission, he was tortured ten times to make him confess some supposed treachery. The poor man was hung from a wall by his hands with a sharp circle of iron round each wrist pressing on the artery, his legs bent backwards and his heels tied to his thighs. On one occasion he was left for seven hours. During all this agony his patience was perfect, and his only exclamations were such pious words as, *Deus tibi se; tu te Deo.* For four days was he left in the hands of the inhuman Topcliffe, when he was removed to the Gatehouse. Here among the poorest and vilest of prisoners a month passed in semi-starvation and filth. When his father was allowed to see him, he was found to be so covered with dirt, swarming with vermin, and reduced to the last extremity that, shocked beyond measure at the shameful spectacle, he presented a petition to the Queen begging "that if his son had committed anything for which by the laws he had deserved death he might suffer death; if not, as he was a gentleman, he hoped Her Majesty would be pleased to order that he should be treated as a gentleman, and not be confined any longer in that filthy hole."[3] The Queen gave orders for his removal to the Tower, where for nearly three years he re-

[1] We shall consider the subject of Equivocation later on.

[2] "At the end of July 1592, Topcliffe took her off to Greenwich, and there had her married to Nicholas Jones, servant to himself and to Pickering, the keeper of the Gatehouse. After this Anne was taken to Topcliffe's house in Lincolnshire, and was there delivered of a child about Christmas" (Mr. R. Simpson in the *Rambler*, vol. i. pp. 108, 109. See also *Harleian MS.*, 6998, fol. 21).

[3] Challoner, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests* (ed. 1741), vol. i. p. 325.

mained at his father's charge. At the end of this time Southwell wrote to Cecil humbly entreating that he might be brought to trial; and the answer was, that if he was in so much haste to be hanged he should quickly be satisfied. On 18th February 1595 he was removed to Newgate, and two days after was arraigned at Westminster before Sir John Popham and others, on the charge of high treason, according to the 27th of Elizabeth, "whereby all subjects born within this land which since the feast-day of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, in the first year of Her Majesty's reign, were, or at any time after should be, made priests by authority derived from the See of Rome, and which, then being in the realm did not within forty days after depart out of the land, or which, after the said forty days, should at any time come into be, or remain within the same, were by that Act made traitors and to suffer as in the case of high treason."[1] Southwell, it is clear by the words of the Act itself, was condemned for the mere crime of Catholic priesthood. On the morning after the trial (21st February), he suffered at Tyburn in his thirty-fourth year. It is remarkable that many of those Jesuits who followed Campion in his life and virtues were sharers in his crown,[2] while the followers of Parsons, as a rule, escaped. The loyal suffered in place of the politicians, who took care to reap the credit of the heroism of their victims.

While these were suffering, the political wing was not neglecting to forward Parsons' scheme of securing the control of the Clergy in England. From the very beginning, as we have seen, this was assumed as a matter of course. Parsons sent them hither and thither, Heywood gave laws, and Gerard looked after the temporal interest of those who were recommended by the Jesuit Superiors of the seminaries. But it was not to be supposed that such officiousness could exist for long without remonstrance. While Allen lived, indeed, there could be no open attack upon the liberty of the Clergy; but the ground could be carefully prepared.

We have now to turn to a page of history which is the

[1] Quoted by Foley, vol. i. p. 365.

[2] At this period other Jesuits were executed for their priesthood only: John Cornelius (4th July 1594) and Henry Walpole (7th April 1595).

saddest among the records of English Catholics. But it will not be without profit, if, before we enter upon disputes which at first sight may seem to be squabbles, too contemptible for notice, we make clear to the reader what were the principles at stake. Parsons and his religious brethren may be fairly credited with simply carrying out in English ecclesiastical matters the same principle the Society was aiming at in the whole world. As we have remarked, the Counter-Reformation took the form of a general tightening up of every bond to Rome. Liberty to Latins means Licence. It never enters into their mind that the best remedy for the abuse of Liberty, is more Liberty, which brings more responsibility. But the idea of the Society was to reduce, by obedience, the individual to nothing. Thus liberty is especially antagonistic to Jesuit ideas. The policy of concentration then in full force in Rome was one eminently in keeping with the Latin ideas of the Society; and the English Jesuits were only acting according to them when they tried to train Catholics at large in the same way as their own novices. The principle of Authority was emphasised, as long as that authority was Jesuit, or at least under their direction; but this was done at the cost of personality, episcopacy, and nationality. And in the course of this history we shall find this policy carried out consistently. Men took up the position of leaders, and claimed in the name of religion the right of so doing. They forgot, however, to make themselves capable for the post. Overawed by their religious claims, the laity submitted to the yoke, and it was only when it was too late that they realised that they had been lead by blind men. That means were used which could only plead in justification the end held in view, is a point upon which History gives no uncertain answer. In excuse we can only suggest that exaggerated view of life which men must have when they confine themselves to the contemplation of a half-truth. For a truth, regarded too much in one light, is only a half-truth, which leads one to accept fancies in place of facts.

On the other side, while fully and generously recognising in its true light the principle for which the Jesuits were contending, in so far as it was consistent with the teaching of the Gospel, the Clergy and the bulk of the laity did not lose sight

of that other principle of Personality which is equally important or perhaps more so, being the basis upon which Authority itself is built. The supremacy of Conscience was what these were in reality fighting for; that is to say, for the truth that man is not a mere part of a system. He is a person, and stands or falls in his own personality. The Clergy recognised seriously that Authority, to be of any practical use must be based, not on brute-force or unreasoning submission but on Conscience. Thus they stood between two forces, one on either side, the Government and the Jesuit; each claiming what could not be surrendered. Hence, from this point of view the disputes which arose between the Jesuits with their following and the bulk of the English Catholics gain a new significance, and are of interest as being of grave and far-reaching effects, which exert an influence to-day.

The whole point is in a nutshell. Did the Jesuits aim at subjugating the Clergy and, through them, the laity? Dispute about this detail or that, we have, at this date, abundant evidence that this was a settled and systematised line of policy. It naturally resulted from their standpoint, which was summed up by one of their friends—Sega—in this fashion: the Society was essential to the existence of religion in England; its members were necessary to counsel, strengthen, and protect the laity; to support, correct, and restrain the Clergy: the Jesuits were the salt of the earth and the sun of the heaven of the English Church.[1] With such ideas acted upon, it was inevitable that a conflict would ensue.

That there was any desire to subjugate the Clergy, is indirectly denied by Jesuit writers. But facts are stronger than words; even if we qualify the denials with the reservation that no unlawful supremacy was aimed at; and facts taken in their general tendency, not as isolated incidents, make up history and give us a clear view of the drift of polities. When beside these we have the very explicit statement of a notable Jesuit that Parsons did exercise supremacy over the greater body of the Clergy, there is no resisting the conclusion that there was a desire to subjugate them. Fr. William Holt wrote a paper in

[1] S. P. O. (*Roman Transcripts*) (Stevenson) from *Bibl. Vat. MS. Ottoboni* 2, 473 fol. 185 *et seq.*

1596 (the draft of which is preserved in the Westminster Archives) on *How the Catholic Religion was maintained in England during thirty-eight years of Persecution, and how it may still be preserved there.*[1] After speaking of Allen's work at Douai, he refers to Parsons' position in the following terms: "On the other hand, Parsons was commissioned by his General to superintend the same mission, so far as the fathers of the Society were concerned in it, together with such priests as might be sent from the Spanish seminaries, which, as we have said, owe their foundation to his endeavour. Thus the important work of the English mission is under the guidance and control of these two illustrious men; not as though there were two, but as one alone, etc." As Allen, "Our Moses," as Holt calls him, died some two years before this paper was written, it is pretty clearly avowed that Parsons had now taken up the control altogether, especially as there were, on Holt's evidence, only forty or fifty Marian priests left in England, the rest being seminary priests who were educated directly or indirectly under Jesuit influence.

What brought conviction home to the minds of English Catholics that their liberty was in peril was the dispute known in contemporary literature as the "Wisbeach Stirs." We have a very full account of it by one of the persons there, Dr. Christopher Bagshawe, who wrote: *A True Relation of the Factions begun at Wisbeach by Fr. Edmunds alias Weston, a Jesuite, 1595, and continued since by Fr. Whalley alias Garnet, the Provincial of the Jesuits in England, and by Fr. Parsons in Rome with their adherents. Against us the secular priests, their brethren and fellow-prisoners, that disliked of novelties and thought it dishonourable to the ancient ecclesiastical discipline of the Catholic Church that secular priests should be governed by Jesuits.* From this and the abundant literature on the topic we will briefly draw out the nature of the dispute. But unfortunately in Weston's autobiography, just at the point where he was going to give his account of the Wisbeach scandals, the manuscript is mutilated. As the autobiography has always been in Jesuit custody, it is perhaps not difficult to assign a reason for the mutilation.

[1] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. i. p. 379.

Wisbeach Castle, an old building partly dismantled, was chosen, among other castles, as a prison for Catholics. It stood in the dreary Fenland district, shrouded in mists that crept up from the sea. It was surrounded by pools of stagnant waters that gave a desolate look to all the country round. Thither in 1580 the gentle Fecknam, last Abbat of Westminster, together with Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, and other of the Marian Clergy were removed and "lived in great unity and brotherly kindness; every man intermeddling only with his own affairs and private meditation." When the company grew larger the same peaceful spirit prevailed. "If at any time some little indiscretion happened in any, a word (especially of his ghostly father) was more than sufficient to reform it: or if upon such like an occasion Bishop Watson was moved to reprove this or that, his answer was, What? are we not fellow-prisoners? Are we not at the commandment of another? Shall I add affliction to one that is afflicted? Are we men who profess ourselves to be an example to others in suffering for our conscience, and shall we not be thought thus able without controllers to govern ourselves? Be content. I will not take upon myself to reprove my fellow prisoners."[1] The spirit of Fecknam, a man of conscience and peace, still reigned in the prison.[2]

When the Babington conspiracy was discovered and the Armada was threatening, about thirty prisoners from elsewhere were sent to Wisbeach. "In which number was Master Edmonds *alias* Weston, a Jesuite: a man who, after Heywood's departure out of England, was sent hither by Parsons from Paris to be his substitute or provincial."[3] To quote a recent account: Fr. Weston "was not content with letting things be as he found them. It seemed to him that it would be highly advantageous if the prisoners were reduced to the regularity of life to which he had been accustomed.[4] His first step was to get his confessor [Mr. Dryland, afterwards a Jesuit] a secular priest, elected superior over the prisoners. This plan

[1] *A True Relation*, pp. 2, 3.

[2] Fecknam died October 1584.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 4.

[4] Bagshawe says, "by the space of a week, but Fr. Weston (having in him the relics of his late provincialitie) began to cast about how he might advance himself above his brethren" (p. 4).

was negatived. Other proposals of a like nature were brought forward; but they, too, were invariably rejected. This went on for seven years until Allen's death, when Weston, having arranged the plan with his adherents, suddenly withdrew from the common table. His absence being remarked, he was questioned as to the reason, and promptly declared, that unless his companions submitted to a regular mode of life his conscience would not allow him to join their society. He had a following of eighteen priests and one Jesuit lay-brother."[1] The object of the separation was, in Weston's own words, "to shame the other party."

The project had evidently been well prepared; and it is more than probable that Weston was not acting solely on his own initiative. Parsons had been kept informed on everything that was going on at Wisbeach, and he was the director of all. In answer to a letter from him, complaining that Garnett was not explicit enough in his information, the latter replied (6th September 1594): "The like I say of my cousin William's company, where I understand in general by him that things go worse and worse, with no order, but confusion and danger of great scandal. If you think it be not too late to seek to remedy such things, you may take order; but in this I can say no more than I have written already."[2]

It was in February 1595 that the dispute broke out. Between the previous September and that date, Parsons had ample time to acquaint himself with the exact state of affairs, and take the necessary steps. Had the priests at Wisbeach submitted, it would have been a great step on the way towards realising his project.

The eighteen priests who followed Weston chose him their superior, and wrote to Garnett to confirm the election (7th February 1595), saying that Weston had accepted the charge, subject to Garnett's consent. This was of course readily given;[3] but under conditions that the appearance of superiority was to be avoided. Jouvency states that Weston drew up a plan of life, and added therewith certain laws for

[1] Author's *English Black Month of St. Benedict*, vol. i. p. 247.

[2] Foley, vol. iv. p. 45.

[3] Garnett consulted with Southwell and Baldwin upon the matter.

the benefit of his following.[1] In reporting the affair to the General (12th July 1595), Garnett says he agreed to the petition, which was so fitting, especially as the scope of "our mission" is to help not only the laity but also the Clergy, and that if he refused to give them Weston they would have no one to rule them. Parsons in the *Briefe Apologie*[2] writes to make out that Weston "had wholly refused, and could not be persuaded" to accept the superiority; but, perhaps in a moment of abstraction, he endorses the letter of 7th February 1595, which had been sent to him, as "pro *confirmanda* electione P. Edmundi."

Weston's faction, in defence of their separation, charged their fellow-priests, prisoners like themselves for conscience' sake, with drunkenness, fornication, gambling with the alms of the faithful, and general riotous living. Following a favourite device, general charges were made, and when pressed to particularise, the calumniators sheltered themselves under the plea of charity. Weston himself did so too. "And yet will the Jesuits go about (as Fr. Weston did then unto me) to defend that no wrong was done unto any, withal no man was named in particular.[3] This faction being the more numerous tried to master the others, and seized upon the common property. They also managed to get control over the alms that were sent for the support of the prisoners. An open schism now broke out, and lasted for months. The scandal got abroad, and the suffering Catholics found their spiritual guides at open warfare one with the other. Naturally the laity followed suit, and two parties were formed: those who through thick and thin favoured the Jesuits; and those who opposed them just as violently. Nor was the scandal confined to Catholics. The pulpits of the Established Church resounded with mockery at the way these Christians loved one another.

Two of the older Clergy, Mush and Dudley, hastened from the north to get Garnett to restrain his men from keeping up the broil. But at first he met them stiffly, with the assertion "that he saw no reason why the priests in England should not as well be governed by the Jesuits here as they were and

[1] P. 29. [2] P. 73.
[3] *A Reply to Fr. Parsons' Libel*, p. 7.

had been in the colleges beyond the seas."[1] But he seems to have become frightened at the results of Weston's endeavour, and at last agreed to interfere. After many attempts at arbitration, a peace was patched up; and on 6th November 1597, after a nine months' schism, the two parties met again at the common table.

As the best defence of Christopher Bagshawe, whose book gives the fullest account, it will be enough to quote from Garnett's letter to him under the date (8th October 1595): "Allow them to live according to their wish; for no vow or law forbids it. Meanwhile do you live as you wish; that is as becomes learned and pious priests, as you have hitherto done; for it is not fair that you should be bound by new rules without your freest consent."[2]

But the effects of these "broils" were felt in Rome and in Flanders; and the quarrel between Jesuit and anti-Jesuit was carried to an excess of violence on either side. The students of the English college were again in rebellion. The English rector after Parsons—Joseph Creswell—had been removed by Allen's authority on account of his "indiscrete and tyrannical behaviour"; and Italian rectors had been again appointed. The system of spying[3] led to most disgraceful charges. Fr. Harewood, the minister, charged some of the students with an unmentionable crime, and took such public steps in consequence that the students were in an uproar, loudly denouncing him to the Pope as fit for the galleys.[4]

The old complaints were renewed, that the college intended for the advantage of the Clergy was being turned into a nursery for the Jesuits, who beguiled with marks of favour such of the students as were affected towards the Society. Clamouring petitions went into the Pope from all sides for

[1] *Ibid.* The authorship of this book has been disputed; but from the fact that the writer had personal communication with Weston, he was probably William Clargenett or Clarionet [at Rheims, 1585], who was one of the Wisbeach prisoners.

[2] *Tierney*, iii. p. cxiii.

[3] *Angeli Custodes* were appointed, who sounded privately their companions on their sentiments; and by speaking against the Jesuits, drew them out to express their opinions.

[4] See Dr. Ely's *Certaine Briefe Notes*, p. 77. Ely is a witness whose impartiality cannot be questioned.

the removal of the Jesuits altogether from the college, and also from the English mission. An attempt at introducing the *Book of the Succession* for reading during meals was flatly opposed.[1] The English students at Rome were loyal, and would have none of Parsons' Spanish intrigues.

The Pope ordered a visitation; and Cardinal Sega, who only saw as he was told to see, drew up a report, which is a model of partiality and fulsome praise.[2] Cardinal Toledo, himself a Jesuit, had been appointed vice-protector of the college during the absence of Cardinal Cajetan in Poland. But, as Jouvency says, leaving the way pointed out by Sega and approved of by the Pope, he brought the whole affair into the gravest difficulty. He did not dismiss any of the ring leaders.[3] He even thought there might be a good deal to be said on their side. One of the worst was appointed confessor and not only had leave to send or receive letters unopened but to communicate this privilege to whom he would. Toledo went even further. He removed Father Fioravante from the rectorship, and petitioned the Pope to take away the seminary from the Society and make him the head.[4] Cardinal Toledo died soon after. The General himself seems at that moment to be inclined to give up the charge of the seminary.

Barrett, the President of Douai, had been summoned to Rome to help in allaying these disputes, and writes from that place (10th April 1596) an important letter to Parsons, in which after telling what he thought was the cause of the disturbance and the means he had suggested for quelling them, he goes

[1] William Clark says: "Concerning his proposing the Book of Titles to be read in the refectory in Rome in place of a spiritual Lecture used to be read at such time there be divers yet that will depose the same against him; and Mr. Lawberry, now reverend priest, was the man should have read the same, but rejected it" (Foulis, *The History of Popish Treasons and Usurpations* (ed. 1681), p. 503).

[2] S. P. O. (*Roman Transcripts*), *ut supra*. Mgr. Moro "was visitor with Sega who, finding him inclined to equity and no whit partial to the Jesuits, he shaked him off, taking the whole matter into his own hands" (*A Reply to Fr. Parsons' Libel* by W. C., p. 83).

[3] But in 1598 (3rd August) John Sicklemore, one of the mutineers, was gained over and wrote to Bagshawe, "For God's sake, let us follow Father Garnett his counsel in this, which is wholly to conceal these enormous and beastly offences. He is wholly bent to it, that is the mind of our assigned superior, Mr. Blackwell, of his coadjutors and our dearest friends" (*Archpriest Controversy*, i. p. 50).

[4] Jouvency, p. 220.

on to say: that what is really at the bottom of these troubles is the mismanagement of the seminary by the Jesuits then employed. It is remarkable that Parsons in his *Briefe Apologie* (p. 54), where he professes to print this letter,[1] in order to save at all hazards the repute of the Society, suppresses the important part touching the mismanagement. The passage is as follows:—

"Well, father, there must needs be a rector that is skilful in the affairs of England, and such an one as can and will give correspondence to the colleges and your friends abroad; and besides he must be a man of gravity, of countenance, and of authority; and such as deal for matters of England and for the colleges in Flanders must concert with your friends at Douai; otherwise it is not in me to help, nor in all your friends there. O, but these be generalities. Well, I find here and there many particularities that must be amended, whereof I mean to confer with father General whom I find most willing to hear me; and you will concert, I hope. This rector[2] will never be able to rule in this place. Many things I can tell you of that must be amended concerning this college in the manner of government, and concerning better correspondence with the college of Douai, or else you will never have peace. Trust those that be your true friends, although they write not always to your mind; and beware of those that speak fair, and make all well, and condemn all but themselves."[3]

Agazzari gives a lively picture of the state of affairs in a letter to Parsons of 27th August 1596, in which he reports: that the students are violently affected against the Spanish, and openly show their hostility. They speak frequently and cuttingly against the *Book of the Succession* and its author, that is to say Father Parsons as they think, and can hardly bear to hear his name mentioned. They rejoice over the Spanish reverses as at Cadiz, and regret the successes as at Calais. He cannot say whether they hate the Jesuits on account of the Spanish, or the Spanish on account of the Jesuits, or

[1] P. 55 *seq.*

[2] Jerome Fioravante, appointed 27th May 1594, was succeeded by Agazzari, 17th May 1596.

[3] *Tierney*, vol. iii. pp. lxxiv–v.

rather in the interests of Scotland and France hate them both, or for some worse reason.[1]

The report of the Prelate Malvasia, in 1596, to Cardinal Aldobrandini, the Pope's nephew, speaks very clearly of the causes of the disturbances: "Touching these Jesuits, it would be an excellent thing if both in Scotland and also in England they would abstain from interfering in State matters and the affairs of princes, but would attend solely to gaining souls and the advancement of religion. Applying themselves thus to one thing only, they would perhaps labour with greater fruit, and would dispel the suspicion which prevails in these countries that under the veil of piety and devotion, they are concealing various worldly ideas; they would find themselves held in greater esteem, and receive the veneration which is their due. And in connection with this, it is impossible to ignore that there exists in England, between the Jesuits and the *alumni* of the colleges abroad, an antagonism very dangerous to the interests of that kingdom and of Scotland also. For the Jesuits hold it as an axiom established among them, and confirmed by the authority of Father Parsons, that only by force of arms can the Catholic religion be restored to its former state, inasmuch as the property and revenues of the Church, divided as they are among heretics, and having already passed through many hands, can be recovered by no other means. And to bring about this result, they believe that the only arms available are those of Spain; and, whether coming from home or elsewhere, they enter these countries with this idea firmly impressed upon them by their superiors. The *alumni*, on the other hand, are naturally attached to their country, opposed to the idea of a revolution, and the evils consequent on the introduction of foreign sovereigns and the law of Spain,"[1] etc. etc. etc.

In Flanders the anti-Jesuit movement was perhaps more violent than elsewhere. Already there was great discontent among the English exiles in Flanders at the harsh, tyrannical behaviour of Fr. William Holt, Parsons' deputy. Through his hands passed the pensions allowed by Philip, and these were used to secure political adherence to the Jesuit policy. One of

[1] *Ibid.* p. lxxv.

[2] Bellesheim's *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland*, iii. pp. 469, 470.

the chief opponents of Holt and Parsons was William Giffard, appointed Dean of Lille in 1595. In the May of that year he writes from the Nuncio's house at Brussels to Throgmorton, that Parsons, and his faction, Stanley, Holt, etc., "be instruments of all this mischief, and deal so factiously to the ruin of our nation," and that "Parsons seeks the simple monarchy of England *per fas et nefas*."[1] When the *Book on the Succession* came out, Giffard saw the value of the saying, "Oh, that mine enemy would write a book." He tells Throgmorton (15th June 1595) what he has done. ". . . I have told all to the Nuncio, and have made him to prepare the mind of the Pope and the Rector of the Jesuits by letters heretofore, and as soon as may be I will go to Louvain. I will give the Nuncio the sum of all. He assured me that as long as the Pope lives that Parsons should never rise, and bid me ware the wench to take heed, and the Bishop of Cassano to take heed of the humour of the King of Spain. . . . The Nuncio promised to send this sweet book in compendio to the Rector of the Jesuits and the Pope for a token which she shall wear at her neck. I have made an abstract of Parsons' book, and given it to the Nuncio, who is mad at Parsons, and bid me write to the Bishop of Cassano, and assure him that Parsons had ruined himself, and that the Pope would detest his sluttish behaviour, and that he never could have done anything more disgustable to the Pope."[2]

When the book was found to have created so much feeling, Parsons was not sorry that he had published it under the name of "Doleman." When taxed with its authorship, he used to seek to evade acknowledging it, and made suggestions that Allen and Sir Francis Englefield were the authors. Allen, having been concerned in the former memorial on the subject, could, with a little arrangement of the truth, be said to have had some share substantially in the new book.

Giffard reports that the Nuncio said "Parsons would never rise as long as the Pope lived." This was in reference to the attempt that was being made by Parsons' friends in Flanders, Italy, and Spain[3] to get him the cardinal's hat

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 252, No. 8. [2] *Ibid.* vol. 252, No. 66.

[3] In a letter (anonymous) from Madrid, dated November 10/20, 1585 (1595?), now

vacant by Allen's death (1594). They were working very zealously for it in opposition to the claims of Stapleton and the Bishop of Cassano, who were the chief nominees of the other party. The Jesuit party in Flanders were particularly active, and petitions were sent round for signatures drawn up by Dr. Worthington (of whom more anon), which describe Parsons as "the Lantern of the Country."[1]

A wild burst of indignation now broke out against Holt and his satellite, Hugh Owen. Parsons at first defended Holt as necessary in Flanders for the promotion of the design on England. But in view of the attitude taken towards Holt by the Spanish authorities in Flanders, Parsons thought it would be better to have him transferred to Spain. In a letter to the General, dated Seville, 12th May 1595, Parsons says of Holt: "For although he is by nature a stiff man (*de condicion secca*), yet he is *homo probatae virtutis*, and has a good head; moreover, he has this quality, most important in our present work, that his ways of thought and speech fall in with those of others."[2] But as to Owen, he was quite willing to throw him overboard.[3] Meanwhile the anti-Jesuit party sent in petitions to Rome, praying not only for the removal of Holt, but of all Jesuits from England, and from the control of the seminaries. How this was met appears from a letter written by James Younger (at Douai) to Dr. Giffard (12th November 1596):—

"We hear by Dr. Worthington that certain who term themselves chief and principal of our nation have written to the Pope that they are tyrannised by our English Jesuit here in France with like tyranny they have complained to be used by the Jesuits in England against our seminary priests. . . . To give a counter-buff to these men's proceedings, who have thus

at Hatfield, the writer tells his "good cousin": "Here is of late come to the Court, Fr. Parsons greatly in favour of His Majesty. We are persuaded he shall be made cardinal and legate for England; though they say Dr. Griffin stands for it and is much favoured of His Holiness. Wherefore I pray you give us advertisement what you hear, for we are all here affected to Fr. Parsons" (*Hatfield MSS.* vol. iv.).

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. (Addenda), vol. 34, No. 40.

[2] "Archives, S.J.," quoted in *Month*, No. 424, p. 351.

[3] *Tierney*, vol. iii. p. lxxxvii.

reported against the priests, Dr. Worthington has taken in hand this worthy journey, as to travel up and down, from place to place, to get every man's hand who will not be counted a miso-Jesuit, to subscribe to a bill drawn by him and his therein, to clear Fr. Holt from all crimes, as likewise the Jesuits in England. We all here would gladly have shunned to intermeddle in this matter, wherein we know nothing what just accusations may be laid against Fr. Holt or others in England, whose dealings are altogether unknown to the most here. Yet we are importuned, yea, and violently persuaded, by one who will not easily relent from his own preconceived opinion (. . .), we must all forsooth needs subscribe to a letter drawn in testimony of the father's innocency, against whom, in truth, we know nothing; and this much we would willingly testify. But this is not reckoned sufficient; we must also say that we disallow and disprove and count slanderous all that the other parties object against the Jesuits. To this we oppose, that in conscience we cannot, seeing we know not the causes by which the others are moved to write to the Pope: we offer to write to the President a blank wherein he may testify in all our names that which in conscience he thinketh may be said. This is not yet enough; but we must write to Father Alphonso (*Agazzari*) in case the President be absent; and Father Alphonso must have our names to use when necessity shall require."[1]

Dr. Worthington, who was devoted to Father Parsons, and who had already made a temporary vow of obedience to him, was zealous on the other side. Attestations in favour of Father Holt and the Jesuits were signed through his means by eighteen priests, ninety-nine lay folk, including soldiers and women. The name of Guy Fawkes, of Gunpowder fame, figures in the list.[2]

There was trouble also arising from another quarter. Father Creighton was furious with Parsons for throwing over James VI. as heir to the English Crown. A correspondence between the two ensued. From a letter written by Parsons from Seville (10th May 1596) we can see how the question rested:

[1] *Tierney*, vol. iii. pp. xc. xci.

[2] *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. lxxv.

"As regards the other business of the royal succession, about which your Reverence writes, I hardly know what to say, or whether I ought to say anything about it, especially as I could wish that we were more engaged with a heavenly than an earthly kingdom; but since the evil of the times, and the extreme calamity of our country cause us to labour in order to secure its salvation, which depends upon the restoration of the Catholic religion, we are not able to do so without also considering the question of a Catholic successor. I will therefore take this opportunity of telling your Reverence what I think.

"From the year 1580 when, by our superior's orders, I first went to England, I began to study the welfare of the King of Scotland in every possible way, and at once sent at my own expense a certain priest, William Watts, into Scotland. I afterwards sent in Father Holt. And as the affairs went on well, I wrote to our General to send into Scotland some of the Scotch members of the Society, and when it was determined that your Reverence should make a trial, you will easily recollect how willingly I assisted you at Rouen, and gave you my only companion to accompany you into Scotland, and upon your return I spared neither counsel nor help. I undertook with great peril of my life a hard and difficult journey into Spain, and on to Lisbon, and then one as difficult into Flanders, and a third to Rome itself. And all this, for the sake, after God, of the King of Scotland and his mother; for whom, although I was not able to accomplish their wishes, I obtained from the King of Spain on two occasions the sum of twenty-four thousand crowns, and from Pope Gregory XIII. four thousand. I am unaware when anyone else has done the like good offices. I am obliged to mention these, in order to oppose those who make me out to be an adversary of the King of Scotland. And no one can be a better witness on my behalf than your Reverence, who knows all this, and can recall it.

"But when upon the death of the Queen (*Mary*) we found that your King persevered in his heresy, I confess that both Allen, not yet made cardinal, and I, showed ourselves to be slow to promote the interests of an heretical King; but what your Reverence said at Rome in the year 1586 I think, and

has often been repeated, nothing could be decided until we had some firm proof of the King's mind, which your Reverence promised to procure us, as you were then about, with others, to set off for Scotland. We willingly waited your return, and after some years all hope was lost to us of the King's reduction; to every assertion you affirmed, both elsewhere and very often in Spain (which other pious and prudent men of our nation will confirm), that there was no use in hoping for the King's conversion to the Catholic faith, which subsequent events have fully proved. And so, I allow that thenceforward Cardinal Allen and myself thought of something else than the King of Scotland, and that our one sole thought was, who was the fittest to be forwarded among all claimants for the purpose of restoring and establishing the Catholic religion and worship in our country; and since, we saw when considering and weighing the degrees of pretence, and the variety of claimants as to the hereditary right, without considering the matter of religion, as you also saw from the book recently brought out on this matter, what was lawful for good men to do, or what was their duty on the point of religion, that is, whether they ought or could with safe conscience follow in a doubtful claim a pretender who was an heretic, or at least suspected as such, while there is plenty of Catholic pretenders. Everyone of pious mind will see this.

"I have already said to you, and it is indeed most true, that I exceedingly wish that we had nothing to do with the affairs of earthly kingdoms; but since our sins have caused that in the upheaval of our country, political affairs and religion should be so intermixed and perplexed that the restoration of one cannot be treated of without the other, nor can the Catholic religion be restored without a Catholic Prince, and since so much has been already done, not only in great labour, but also in shedding of blood, we cannot but be solicitous of the latter from which all depends. And so what I have often said in your presence (and what I remember our beloved Allen to have done also) I now once more repeat: the one thing and first of all that I look for in our future ruler is that he be a true Catholic; let him be of what nation, race, or language he will;

and if he be not this or be doubtful, I will regard neither his country nor his person, nor any kind of hereditary claim which I cannot admit against the cause of God, although otherwise most valid. How weak the claim of the King of Scotland is, and how other claims are just as good, can be seen by what I have said in the book lately published; and I think you remember it well. Indeed, I greatly wonder that you are so changed as to write that you were not of those who were ready to exclude the King of Scotland, for no one showed himself more ready or riper for the matter, or more efficaciously persuaded us and others with almost infinite arguments. And so we should be fools and miserable men, after such trouble undertaken for sustaining the Catholic religion, so many dangers escaped, and so many martyrdoms, if we were to commit once more all our and God's affairs, and the happiness of our country into the hands of an heretical, or at least doubtful, King. This is my judgment, this is my feeling, and before God and His angels I only seek the divine glory in all this business, and I care nought who enjoys the kingdoms of this world, provided we seek and procure for others the heavenly kingdom. Receive this calmly, and with your accustomed friendliness, and communicate it as you think well to our and your friends, and commend me to the divine mercy in your holy sacrifices.[1]—Your Reverence's Servant in Xt.

"Seville, 10th May 1596."

To this Creighton replies (20th August 1596): "I allow that all you say about our King and nation is true. Concerning the *Book of the Succession* I have but little to say. When I wrote that it was *precocem*, this is to be understood of its publication, which seems to me and many others to be at a time prejudicial to many of those whom it pleases you to recall. What benefit has arisen from the publication I don't know but I do know what mischief has arisen. There is a French proverb: 'You can't catch a hare by beating a drum,' etc."[2]

Parsons defends his book in a letter from Madrid (2nd November 1596): "As regards what you so fully say against

[1] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. ii. pp. 381–383.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 384.

the *Book of Succession*, I do not wish to discuss the matter by letters, for I see from what different points of view we look at the matter. If we were together it might be more easy to arrive at one and the same opinion. You think the publication of the book was untimely, and quote the French saying that the hare is not to be taken by beating a drum. To which I reply, that the book was carefully read before publication by the most prudent of our countrymen who could be found in Spain, Italy, and Belgium, and perhaps also in England, and it did not seem untimely to them, but well matured, and very necessary for the times, and its publication most opportune, and they thought that nothing hitherto written was so useful for promoting the Catholic cause. Concerning the drum, if you choose to say the publication is a drum, I would say that this drum is not intended to catch a hare, but to frighten off the wolf who tries to get in under cover of night. Since by law the heretics have forbidden, under high treason, any one to discuss the question of succession, it is clear that the heretics wish while the question of rights is obscured, to take advantage of this ignorance and foist on us an heretical successor. This plan must be discovered by the beating of this drum. Christian and Catholic princes will be stirred up by this drum, to see what are their own rights, and what is to be done for the Christian Commonwealth; and chiefly the Pope who, besides the universal power given to him by God for defending religion, has a particular right of majesty, and supreme dominion in England, which he will be able to lawfully use in settling this great difficulty, if he can understand the claims and actions of each pretender. Lastly, by this drum the English Catholics will be awakened to consider what they must do when the necessity arises of taking one side or the other, and not have recourse to arms before taking counsel on so grave a matter. So if this book is to be called a drum, it would not seem to be either absurd or badly sounding, inasmuch as it has so many advantages for the public good. And although you say you don't know of any good it has done, and are certain of many evils thence arising, I, on the other hand, bring forward these good reasons and can produce most reliable witnesses from England, who can affirm that this book has done good

beyond any other written, as time itself will more fully show. I know nothing about the mischief you speak of, for what is said about the increase of persecution, we know, on the contrary, that after its publication, Catholics of England have been much more mildly treated. About Scotland I can say nothing more than what you write, that two fathers of the Society have been set at liberty by the King, and that others have been kindly treated; and the fact is eloquent that before the publication of the book the King of Scotland put Lord Fentry to death for the Catholic religion, but after its appearance no one, as far as I know, has suffered. Neither is there, indeed, any reason why the King of Scotland should be more cruel to his Catholic subjects on account of this book, etc.

"I confess I desire that a man of known faith and constancy should possess the kingdom, and, as far as I can, I will oppose all heretics or those suspected of heresy. We have suffered enough already by that mistake by which English Catholics, when Queen Mary was dead, preferred Elizabeth for the sole reason that she was English (though of doubtful faith) to Mary, the Catholic Queen of France, who was a Scotchwoman, whom, afterwards, however, with danger of their own lives, they wish to have in place of the Englishwoman. And so, lest we should fall again into the same mistake, and, according to the Gospel, our latter state be worse than the former, I judge that in so great a matter we should not trust to any triflings (*lenociniis*) or any dubious hope, but look in the first place to the chief and principal thing. Provided he be truly Catholic and a prince of proved faith, what part of the world he comes from matters but little, provided he is capable of obtaining, guarding, and keeping possession of the kingdom, and that the Pope (whose interest is the greatest of all) approves of the choice. His judgment in a doubtful matter should be our chief rule as to what is the best, for us and for the Christian Commonwealth, to the greater glory of God; towards which end I think that book about which we have spoken has brought no small light. I have nothing more to write on this matter."[1]

His policy being thus attacked in Rome, in Flanders, and in England, it was no time for Parsons to be in Spain. There

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 384-386.

he had accomplished his work, and the time had come for the consolidation of his whole plan. Allen was dead nearly three years, and his name had not the same power it had. All things called Parsons to Rome. The hour was propitious and events had proved he must strike now or never. At the end of the year 1596, he set out on his journey. It must have been in the summer of that year that he made up his mind to go to Rome, for in the last letter Sir Francis Englefield wrote (8th September) on his deathbed to Philip, he says: "With regard to the journey of Father Parsons to Rome, although on the one hand I see the good likely to result from it, yet, on the other, knowing the hatred and aversion with which he is regarded by the Scottish and French factions (who in consequence of his reply to the Queen's Edict of the book written on the Succession, and discovering the hitherto unknown pretensions of Portugal and Castile to the English Crown, and of other things which the said father has written and done, and daily continues to do, on that side of the question, consider him as the leader of the party attached to your Majesty's interests), knowing this, I say, it always has appeared, as it still appears to me, that his journey will involve him in the greatest danger, unless he goes strongly supported by your Majesty, with an express order to the ambassador at Rome to prevent his detention there, through any contrivance of the opposite party; to provide for his safety during his residence in Italy; and to have assistance at hand in case of any emergency; and even with all these precautions I fear for the consequences.

"The project which Parsons told me he had discussed with your Majesty's ministers, a few months since at Toledo, of a special conference on the affairs of England, to be held in Flanders, under the presidency of the cardinal, archduke, and to be joined by some confidential persons of the English nation, is of so much importance that, until it is effected, and until the nation shall possess some head[1] securely attached to your Majesty's interests, I shall look for no favourable issue to the affairs of England, deranged as they constantly will be by the arts of the factions."[2]

[1] Englefield was a great advocate of Parsons' cardinalate.

[2] *Tierney*, vol. iii. pp. l. li.

Parsons, however, during his stay in Spain, had not beer confining himself solely to the affairs of the seminary. He was urging the King to undertake another Armada. If Philip fell in with the suggestion, Parsons took care that the Jesuit interest should be duly consulted. He drew out a memorandum headed "Principal Points to facilitate the English Enterprise," and sent it to Martin de Idiquez. In this he first urges the King to vow to restore "in a moderate way" the ecclesiastical property wrested from the Church by Henry VIII. The most godly men of the country with whom he had discussed the matter agreed, he said, that in that way alone would God be appeased and bless the undertaking. Parsons knew very well that the main difficulty was that English Catholics would not have anything to do with the Spaniards, and that they saw through Philip's pretences. But Parsons evidently had hopes that they might yet be cajoled. The "fervent Catholics" he mentions are, of course, those of his way of thinking. He says: "In order to diminish the suspicion which our opponents arouse as to the intentions of His Majesty, namely, that he wishes to seize the country for himself, they write to me from England that it is very advisable that a declaration should at once be made by His Majesty on this point, because, although the fervent Catholics, looking to religion alone, will be willing to submit themselves absolutely to His Majesty, a much larger and more powerful majority do not wish the Crown of England to be joined to that of Spain. In order to please these and disarm the other Christian princes who fear the same thing it would greatly facilitate the enterprise if His Majesty were to allow his views to be known on this point in the way he considers most convenient. One very good way would be for a little tract to be written by some reputable Englishman, who might set forth that for the general welfare it would be advantageous that all should agree to accept the Infanta of Spain. The tract might assume, as a generally accepted fact that His Majesty does not and never has claimed the Crown for himself." This suggestion Parsons knew was absolutely untrue; for he had written his *Book of the Succession* in order to forward the Spanish claim.

After proposing that "the English exiles in Flanders should

make constant raids, summer and winter," on the English coast, and that such a course would make them very desperate, "as they would know that if they were caught there would be no pardon for them," the Jesuit suggests that those who had Scotch leanings should be removed from any place where they could do harm. And adds significantly that "His Majesty should treat with some amount of confidence his adherents and friends. This would encourage others."

The excommunication of the Queen should be renewed by the Pope, and the paper Allen had drawn up in 1588 should be reprinted. Dr. Stapleton should be made a Cardinal, or he should be Bishop of Durham or Ely, and "energetic, respected, and influential Englishmen," as Drs. Worthington and Pierce, should be joined with him as Bishops of Carlisle and Chester. But if the fleet went by way of Ireland, "it might be better to give the title of Archbishop of Dublin to another grave English priest who lives at Rome, and is a relative of Cardinal Allen" . . . and "a firm adherent of His Majesty." This was Richard Haddock or Haydock, whose name we shall meet with again. The lengthy document thus concludes: "Finally, the great point which ought to be considered first is to obtain very good information from England of everything that is being done or said by the enemy. . . . An attempt may now be made to amend matters, as Father Henry Garnett, Provincial of the Jesuits, writes that trustworthy men may be obtained in London who will get their information at the fountain-head in the Council, and they themselves will provide correspondents in the principal ports who will keep advising as to the warlike preparations." The distinct assertion of Father Garnett's participation in treasonable practices should be noted.[1]

In view of this expedition, which Parsons hoped would start from Lisbon, he sent thither a Jesuit with six seminarists from Valladolid: "They are all experienced men, and I have sent them by different routes under colour of their going to their various missions from Lisbon. The Jesuit father is the only one of them that knows the real design, and he is extremely discreet and of noble English family. I have given him such

[1] *S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iv. pp. 628–633.

instructions as will enable him to direct the rest in case the opportunity occurs of their going in the Armada."[1]

But Philip II. was old. He no longer was beguiled. Although the Jesuits kept continually urging him and his successor to undertake the reduction of England, nothing more was done. But at the period we have now reached, Parsons still was not without hope. Before leaving Valladolid, he summoned together all the seminarists, and told them "that His Majesty was resolutely determined this spring to turn all the forces of this war for the recovery of the realm of England from heresy, and (he, Parsons) wished them to assist him in that enterprise with their (prayers?), and wished them to be ready to go and obey as himself, Father Charles Tancred, the Jesuit, and Dr. Stillington. Moreover, he told them that the King's pleasure was that the Spaniards after the conquest should not be commanders and rulers in England, for that it was resolved that the Cardinal Albert of Austria should marry the Infanta of Spain, and with her enjoy the Crown of England, without altering the ancient customs and prerogatives thereof, all the priests that were ready in the three colleges there (almost thirty) are by commandment stayed to come over with the Armada."[2]

He took good care before reaching Rome to be fortified with strong letters of recommendation from the King, from his friend Jane Dormer, Duchess of Feria, and from the Benedictine Abbat of Valladolid. The latter gives (20th September 1596) the following warm commendation of Parsons' behaviour: "Since Robert Parsons by order of his superiors is about to set out to the feet of your Holiness, it has been thought well if I, Holy Father, should write this letter in which your Holiness may learn from me as an eye-witness of his behaviour whilst dwelling among us in this city of Valladolid, over which church I have, for many years, presided as abbat, and now rule until it is erected by your Holiness into an Episcopal See. Parsons has been a notable example of every virtue and religious life during his stay here, and it was he who secured a foundation by his Catholic Majesty, Philip of the first English college in this city where English youth

[1] *Ibid.* p. 634 (2nd September 1596). [2] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 262, No. 50

are brought up and trained with the greatest care and diligence. Parsons has also set up similar colleges in other cities of Spain, in which I hear the same godly behaviour exists. . . . All these good works are to be attributed to the merits of this same Parsons."[1]

In Sir Francis Englefield's letter we hear the rumour of an intended conference to be held in Flanders on the affairs of England. Parsons was probably proceeding there when, at the end of the year, he met at Barcelona the Duke of Feria and Stephen de Yuarra, the royal ministers, on their way back from Flanders. A conference was held, and as concerns the dispute between the English exiles and Fr. Holt, Parsons advised that the heads of the opposition should be removed to another part of the Spanish dominions. Englefield had already proposed such a measure to the King. The ministers agreed; and the Duke of Feria wrote to the King a letter on the subject. As an example of the Jesuit's masterful way of treating opponents, we print the following extracts from the letter, which has been given in its entirety by Canon Tierney.[2] It is again the voice of the Supplanter:—

"The evil is increasing in a manner that will admit of no delay in the application of a remedy, and the only remedy that has ever occurred to me is to remove the principal agitators from Flanders, all of whom are supported by your Majesty's bounty. . . . I have received positive information that His Holiness informed Dr. Barrett, the President of Douai College, that the same parties (*who had written against Holt, Owen, and his followers*) had written to solicit the removal from Flanders of Father Holt, a member of the Society of Jesus, and the most efficient of your Majesty's servants in that country. The object in all this is evidently to further the interests of the Scottish King. . . . Hence it will be well to remove the heads of the party, particularly Charles Paget, William Tresham, and Ralph Ligon, and having discharged whatever arrears of pension may be due to them, to send them with some allowance into Sicily. In any nearer spot they will possess the means, as in Italy your Majesty knows too many possess the inclination, to work mischief; and we can

[1] S. P. O. (*Roman Transcripts*) (Bliss), vol. lx. No. 6. [2] Vol. iii. p. liii.

scarcely expect that they will fail to employ them . . . (*A. to the others who are married in Flanders*), unless they should again offend, it would only excite compassion in their regard to leave them entirely destitute. Still, it will be well to reprimand them for their misconduct and to inform them at the same time that should they again incur your Majesty's displeasure they will be deprived of their allowance, and at once be removed from your Majesty's dominions. . . . It is a matter of no less importance that your Majesty should command the General of the Society of Jesus to avail himself of some favourable opportunity for removing Father Creighton a member of that Society, who is not only an avowed advocate of the King of the Scots, but who has also frequently spoken to me, with the most passionate feeling, on the subject of that monarch's affairs. As a man, in fact, of vehement temperament—religious, however, in his principles, and esteemed by many for his exemplary demeanour—his influence is capable of producing the most injurious consequences in Flanders and his place, therefore, would be advantageously supplied by Father Gordon, a Scotchman, and uncle to the Earl of Huntley, a quiet and dispassionate person, divested of his prepossession in favour of his own sovereign, and agreeing with those of the English who are proceeding in the right road.

"In Lisle, there is a Doctor Giffard, the dean of that place, a man of good abilities, but of ambitious views possessing, I am told, but little discretion and yet the confidential adviser of the Nuncio Malvasia. At Rome, he is not in bad estimation. His character, in fact, stands higher than that of any other individual belonging to his party, and to increase his importance by accomplishing his purposes he will never hesitate to effect any mischief."

The object of the reference to Giffard, Dean of Lisle, was to prepare the King for an attack which was to be made on this person who had obtained his favour and was now the most weighty and influential of all the English opposed to the Jesuit domination.

A few days after, while still at Barcelona, Parsons, having now made up his mind to support Father Holt altogether, wrote the following letter to the Provincial, Oliver Manareus

who, for the sake of peace, was desirous of getting rid of the father:—

"10*th January* 1597.

"I have received your short letter, dated Brussels, 3rd October, and have seen yours written at length to Fr. Creswell, both of which are upon the same subject, the disputes among our people there (*Flanders*), and advising that the remedy which seems best to you is that we should yield for a while to the importunity of the time and men, and that Fr. Holt should be removed. I have so high a regard for your judgment and known affection towards us, that if nothing else lead me to the same conclusion I should be contented to follow your opinion. But for the last two years and more, other reasons have obtained, and made me of late write on the matter to our reverend father—(1) that by such a plan we should be consulting Father Holt's own peace and quiet, and desire, for he has often and earnestly asked to be taken away; (2) then we really need him here in Spain, and he is greatly desired by the rectors of both seminaries; (3) that Father Creswell knows something about Spanish affairs and speaks the language and has that suavity of manner which you desiderate in Fr. Holt, and so perhaps, as you say, he may be for some time more pleasing and acceptable to certain folk.[1]

[1] Parsons to Aquaviva [Valladolid, 15th July 1593]: "He, Creswell, speaks Spanish well and knows the ways of this court, where he is esteemed by the highest. If he went to Flanders he would carry with him letters of earnest recommendation from the King and other principal persons, which would be of great service to the common good. Add to this that besides being a very safe and religious-minded man, he shows a special talent for negotiation, more so perhaps than for treating with young men in colleges. This we already begin to realise experimentally, and we do not forget the experiences of Rome. . . ." And writing again from Seville [12th May 1595], Parsons adds: "In this point Father Creswell has so far given little satisfaction to the rectors here. They think his ways of thought and speech are peculiar (*sus dictamines son particolares*) and *non secundum usum Communem*. For this reason, and because he has displayed such resolution in pushing his ideas, the fathers here doubt whether they will be able to get on with him, if I were not here. For the rest, they own that he is a very good religious, well-spoken and clear-headed, as in truth he is" (Archives, S.J., quoted in *Month*, No. 424, pp. 350, 351). In the Spanish State Papers there are many remarkable papers concerning this said Creswell. In one to the King [12th September 1596], he says: "I find myself, by His divine grace, so free from personal or national bias in the matter, that if I heard that the entire destruction of England was for the greater glory of God and the welfare of Christianity, I should be glad of its being done" (*S. S. P.* (Simancas), vol. iv. p. 636).

Although I do not expect any such result with those who are trying to get Fr. Holt removed, for the experience of many years on most certain grounds has taught me that it is not the removal of this or that father that is desired but the removal of the Society itself. But of which more later on.

"At Rome, the unruly demanded the removal of Father Edmund Herod (*Harewood*), an Englishman and confessor to the college, and if that were done all would be peaceful, they said; but when he was removed, matters got worse, and they rose up against the Society.[1] Now, I have for some time treated of the removal of Fr. Holt, both with the General and with the father himself, and as soon as I get to Rome will do so again, and I now write this while I am on the way and remember to have told you from letters the cause of my journey, namely, the will of the General and the business of these Spanish seminaries, which will suffer unless I can arrange matters with the Pope. I hope, God willing, to settle things in a short time and return to Spain, and only go on the condition, unless obedience arranges otherwise.

"These things being so and intending to treat of the whole matter with the General, still I can't deny but that grave difficulties have presented themselves to me in carrying out the matter, especially just now. I lay them before your reverence. The first is the Duke of Feria, and Stephen de Yuarra, royal ministers, who have lately arrived here (Barcelona) from Belgium, have told me that in the instructions concerning the state of Belgium, which by order of the King they have left to His Highness the Cardinal Archduke, they have among other matters stated that the Society is exceedingly useful for the royal interests, and therefore it is expedient that by every means it should be encouraged; then upon English affairs which at the present juncture it is most important for the King's interest that they should be well managed, the opinion of Father Holt is to be taken before everyone else, on account of his experience, trustiness, and prudence in action, and no attention is to be paid to those who are jealous of him and try to get him removed from Flanders. They have told

[1] He changed his opinion when he got to Rome. See the following letter of 5th May.

this the King, both by letter and word of mouth. This you will see makes the question of changing Fr. Holt more difficult.

"The second difficulty is also a recent one. From the conversation which Dr. Barrett, the Rector of Douai seminary, had with the Pope, it is understood that those very men who have treated with you and others of our fathers for the removal of Fr. Holt on the score of peace have written to His Holiness, not only against Fr. Holt, but also against all the fathers of the Society who are in England, asserting that they domineer over the rest of the Clergy and rule them as tyrants (which they also assert by name of Fr. Holt), and for this cause ought all to be removed; and by their example and persuasion some of the Roman students have been stirred up to rebellion, and have by memorials asked for the same thing, and have with wicked lies made the same assertion, whereas the fathers only aim at the advantage of all and of these ungrateful men among all others, and besides I can say of Fr. Holt that he has often by letter to the Spanish Court pleaded the cause of those men who now are his chief opponents.

. . . . . .

"As regards Fr. Holt's manner of acting (while the question of his removal is in the hands of the General), if it is harsher than seems fitting to you or too much open to cause hatred or jealousy, as you say, I am sure that at a word Fr. Holt, for the regard he has for you, will readily change his behaviour. I am writing to him on the same matter, namely, that he should console all alike, and win all, taking care to avoid all appearances of dislike in his manner of acting. I ask you to let me know at Rome what you now think of the whole matter, that we may more maturely determine what is to the greater glory of God," etc.[1]

By the middle of March, Parsons had got so far as Genoa on his way to Rome. In a letter of 15th March 1597, he gives to Fr. Holt the following as some of the reasons of his journey, but only refers to his case under the head of "the other controversies of our nation in other places":—

[1] *Tierney*, vol. iii. pp. lxxxiv–lxxxvi.

"The principal causes of my journey to Rome are:[1] first, to establish with His Holiness and with the General such points as are necessary for the seminaries in Spain, Flanders, and Italy, and the English mission of the fathers of the company, and any other business useful for that end, such as faculties, government privileges, and temporal supports." And he asks Holt to send him as soon as possible his suggestions, for he hopes that his stay in Italy will be very short. "Another cause of my journey is to appease the tumults at the English College, and the other controversies of our nation in other places, and to explain to His Holiness and other powerful princes the real causes of the discord. And then the affair of the English Succession, and to get His Holiness to adopt a fixed policy." He states that he is neither for nor against the Kings of Spain or Scotland.[2]

Having arranged all his plans, and made sure of his means, Parsons arrived in Rome at the end of March or the first days of April, and took up his abode in the *Casa Professa*.

[1] Jouvency says that it was the General, Aquaviva, who summoned Parsons to Rome (p. 220).

[2] Upon this Tierney remarks: "This is not strictly true. That he was not commissioned to advocate the *personal* claims of the Spanish monarch, may be correct; but he was the accredited agent of Spain expressly to support the pretensions of the Infanta is evident. . . . From what follows it is clear that his plan was, in the first instance, to propose the matter generally to the Pope, to allow him to reflect on it '*per un pezzo*' . . . and then in case of doubt or difference to urge his own opinion in favour of the Infanta and the Cardinal Farnese. As an additional proof of his agency for the daughter of the King of Spain, I may add that in the following July he wrote to Don Juan d'Idiaquez, mentioning an audience which he had with the Pope, and informing him that the latter appeared *as warm in the cause of the Infanta* as could be desired" (vol. iii. p. lviii).

"And lately that the Pope should arrange with the King of Spain and others for the succession, and in case of doubt Parsons was to suggest the Infanta married to the Cardinal" (*Tierney*, vol. iii. pp. lvii–lix).

CHAPTER VIII

PARSONS "IN CURIÂ"

ARRIVED in Rome some time before 12th April, Parsons set himself to face the difficulty at the English college. When on the spot, he could not help seeing that there were grave faults on the side of his religious brothers. Cardinal Toledo, S.J., as we have said, had strongly taken the part of the students. But as his name figures in the little list Parsons kept of those whom Providence had removed out of the way, it is probable that his action was not looked upon with favour.[1] Many of the scholars, even those of the party clamouring for the restoration of the college to the Clergy, visited him at the *Casa Professa*, and put their case before him. Their one object was "how to end these stirs and to put an end to that which was an occasion of so great scandal."[2] Like the prudent man he was, Parsons showed invincible patience, and listened to all the complaints made. The partisan reports of Sega in his late visitation did not at that moment weigh with him, although afterwards he held practically many of the views contained in that remarkable document. But just now he was face to face with a situation which, in part, had resulted from an opposition to his own views, namely, that Englishmen were better ruled by their countrymen than by foreigners. He was fresh from the same difficulty in Spain. He was quick enough to see the great advantage it would be to the larger end for which he was working, if he could now appear in the graceful

[1] This list is entitled, "An observation of certain apparent judgments of Almighty God against such as have been seditious in the English cause for these nine or ten years past." It is to be found, says Tierney, in the Stonyhurst MSS. (*Ang.* A. II. 44), and would be interesting if reproduced in its integrity.

[2] Bennet (one of the students) to Dr. Hugh Griffin, 16th May 1597, endorsed by Parsons. See *Tierney*, vol. iii. p. lxxx.

rôle of peacemaker, and, where possible, take the side of the seminarists.

He offered to confer with the students and to examine the whole matter, promising them redress and all charitable treatment. For a whole week he listened to what the youths had to say, and from the letter of one of them, to be quoted below, we gather the style of argument he used. It was based on the scriptural injunction: "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison."[1] If opponents who could not be gained were to be relentlessly crushed, Parsons was quite ready to cover with benefits those who submitted.

Meanwhile he had interviews with the Cardinal Protector of the college, and also with the Pope,[2] who, it is said, charged him with being the author of the *Book of Succession*. Parsons unhesitatingly denied the accusation. He was ordered to attempt the pacification of the students, and for this purpose Clement VIII. told him to take up his residence in the English college. Here he was able to see more of both sides of the question, and to continue his interviews with the students. Calling them together, says one of them, Edward Bennet, he "told us we had God's cause in hand, laid before us the detriments that our countrymen suffered abroad because of our troubles, the inconveniences within the college that we found, and, in fine, the harm that the cause of England was like to suffer if that these factions and dissensions did continue. Such and the like discourses being had, we all agreed to deal with Father Parsons and see whether he was able to give that satisfaction which as yet we had not found. Whereupon we had certain conferences with him, debated and disputed all our matter from the beginning, proposed our difficulties and our reasons, which he heard with patience; he, of the other side, the occasions which he thought to have been always the

[1] Matt. v. 25.

[2] Clement VIII. was no friend to the Society, and it required all Aquaviva's unrivalled skill as a diplomatist to keep the peace. But it was not for some years that the serious difficulties began.

hindrance of peace, the mediums to get peace again, and gotten, to preserve it: for you must understand that our intention was to make a solid peace and to find out the occasions of perturbing thereof, and, being found, to root them out. Much ado there was, you must think, in ripping up so many old festered sores; and you must think that he, that with reason should think to please a multitude, must have a good cause and a great deal of patience: but truly it pleased God so to help them all, in this good purpose of theirs, that in all the time of their conference there fell out nothing, of any part, that might give disgust. Father Parsons, for his part, yielded to the scholars, to all things that they themselves had reason for, with such satisfaction of them, that surely I, which have known the very marrow of this action, would never have believed it, if I had not been an agent in it; and he, of the other side, I daresay stood much comforted; so that we made a most sweet, loving, and friendly peace, not only within the college, but also without: and I do hope it will continue, for the scholars be very quiet in mind. And to tell you, as my old friend, I did never think Father Parsons could ever have gotten that love of the scholars as he hath gotten: so that now we have ended all our troubles, the scholars confidently go to confession to the fathers. The Pope's Holiness is wonderfully pleased with it, as he was displeased with our troubles. Cardinal Borgesius, on Ascension day, was with us in the college, and did congratulate with us, and exhorted us to go on in that we had begun: so that hereafter, *væ illi* that gives occasion of dissension. Cardinal Cajetan is expected. Father General is in Naples, but wonderfully satisfied with this good composition; so that I would wish you with your vantage to make your peace, for the Jesuits have carried it away; for the Pope hath determined to give all unto their hands, and hath already given it. Hereafter there is no place left for the complaints of the Low Countries, especially seeing we have here united ourselves, whose disagreements before were the occasion that many men were heard, which now shall not. You know what you have best to do; but if you mean to do any good for our country you must unite with the Jesuits; for the common cause hereafter is like to lie altogether with them.

I have been much exhorted by the Protector to join with Father Parsons, which I have done: and if you do the like, truly I think you will be able to do more good in the common cause. *Necessitas non habet legem.*" [1]

This letter, written under the magnetic personality of Father Parsons, who in all this matter shows to the full his unrivalled powers, passed through his hands; for the letter from which Tierney copied is endorsed by Parsons. Did Parsons let it pass as a note of triumph in his success, and an intimation he had secured at last the supremacy in English affairs? It seems like it, with its undertone of *Væ victis*; especially when we consider the stirs still going on in England and in Flanders. It is interesting to note in passing that, when the youthful correspondent returned to England, he saw matters in their true proportions, and speedily joined the body of the Clergy, and in the near future was a chosen representative in their struggle at Rome for liberty. This letter also indicates the line of argument Parsons used to gain the young men. There was the cogency of visible facts. He urged the Jesuits were the ecclesiastical masters of England. The late refusal of the Mission to the Benedictines (many of the students had joined the Italian monks to escape the domination of the Society), would go far to prove this. The effects of the dissensions at Rome were exaggerated; and he seems to have suggested to the students that they were the sole cause of the other disputes in Flanders and elsewhere. The egotistical vanity of youth was stirred up; and, doubtless, the heroism of a self-sacrifice, which would bring peace to their fellow-countrymen, was set before them.

Parsons, as we see, succeeded for the time in arranging a peace, and won golden opinions all round. True, it was a cheap victory over enthusiastic young men. But to Parsons it meant a great deal towards securing his position in Rome; for the Pope had been much concerned in the frequent disturbances, and was beginning to insist upon the withdrawal of the Jesuits, a course in which the General was only prevented by Parsons from agreeing to. The settlement was not the triumph of diplomatic skill alone. There was

[1] Bennet to Dr. Hugh Griffin (May 16, 1597), *Tierney*, vol. iii. p. lxxxi.

also a sense of the ill-treatment these young men had met with. Under the warmth of his better feelings, Parsons opens his soul in the following letter, written 5th May 1597 to Fr. Holt:—

"My Reverend Good Father,—This letter shall be to you, I hope in God, of great comfort to understand thereby of the happy end which His divine goodness hath given at length to these troubles and disagreements here in Rome; which in truth I found to be greater and more deeply rooted than ever I could imagine (though I had heard much), so are we more bound to Almighty God for the remedy which I believe verily to be found and from the root; as you would also think if you saw that which I do see, and so do many more besides me, that had far less hope of the redress than ever I had.

"The means have been, next to God's holy grace, certain large conferences that we have had alone (I mean all the aggrieved part with me together); wherein we have passed over the whole story of these troubles, and the causes of grief, discontentment, contention, suspicion, emulation, or exasperation, that have been given or taken on both sides: and as, on the one side, I have been contented to hear the scholars, and to yield them reason where I thought they had it on their side, so on the other have they also been content to hear me, when I thought my reason was better than theirs; as also to distinguish where I had presumed that with some reasons there might go accompanied also some passion, suspicion, or sinister interpretation; and so finally, God be thanked, we are come to a full end and conclusion, and all inconveniences that before had either happened or were so presumed, be fully remedied on both parties. The scholars on their side have fully satisfied me, and I have procured to remove all impediments on behalf of the Society, and so shall do for the time to come; so as I heartily hope that never the like shall happen again, and that Almighty God will perform in this thing also for the good of our country, that merciful point which in all other like temptations He is wont to do, as the apostle saith, '*Faciet etiam cum tentatione proventum*'; and

that the union of the college will be better and greater and more solid hereafter than even it hath been hitherto from the beginning. And assure yourself, my good father, that in untwisting of this clue, and unfolding matters past, I have found errors on both sides—*saltem in modo agendi*—which you know may stand with the best intentions in the world. And who will marvel at this, seeing the one were strangers to the other and the other had to deal with strangers? Each part did as much as they knew, and could do no more. Suspicions, aversions, and exasperations were daily multiplied, *et arbiter pacis* was not amongst them. And, to conclude, methinketh that I do see that, if many of the things that have passed here should have happened in the quietest college that we have either in Spain or Flanders, they might have put the peace out of joint (supposing our English disposition), and the suspicions that such things might bring with them, perhaps more than the things themselves. Well, I can say no more in this than St. Peter in the Acts of the Apostles saith of the sufferings of Christ: God hath appointed that so it should be '*implevit autem sic*.' Even so God hath determined that we should pass this cross; and so He fulfilled it by divers men's errors. And as, by His infinite providence, He brought out so much good to all the world, of the former case, so hope I that He will draw no small good also to our country in time of this. Wherefore there remaineth nothing now but to give thanks to Almighty God for this singular mercy of His: and that you signify the same there to all those of our nation as also to any others that have heard of these troubles; for that this union here is not made only within the house but with all in like manner abroad, both of our nation and others, and mainly with the fathers of our Society everywhere; and the success hath so contented His Holiness and all the cardinals, as you would wonder. And this day being the Ascension of our Saviour, the Cardinal Vice-protector, Borgesius, has been here to the college himself, and signified his exceeding great contentment of this event. And the same joy, I doubt not, but that Cardinal Cajetano, the protector, who is expected very shortly, will receive also at his coming: so as now we must assist, all of us, to appease all

rumours that have grown abroad of these stirs in every place, as also to heal such griefs and aversions as thereof have ensued; and in particular to restore and conserve the good name (as much as in us lieth) of any that may have been touched by former reports; and so doing I trust in Almighty God that every day we shall take much comfort one of another, and that you shall have confirmation from me while I stay here of the progress of this good union, and that I shall leave the college also at my departure as it may endure. And this is all I have to say at this time. The Lord Jesus be with you ever: to whom do you commend me, as also to our friends and countrymen with you, to whom I pray you communicate the effect of this letter. From Rome this 5th of May 1597.—Yours ever in Christ our Saviour,

"ROBERT PARSONS."[1]

Upon this letter Tierney judiciously remarks: "Here is a letter penned immediately after the accomplishment of a great work, and flowing from the fulness and the sincerity of the writer's heart. How different from the passionate invectives, the defamatory statements, and the distorted narratives contained in the *Briefe Apologie*, *The Story of the Domestical Difficulties*, and the various letters and memorials, which he afterwards composed on the same subject! But there the spirit of party was at work justifying its own acts, reviling its opponents, and 'condemning,' as Dr. Barrett expresses it, 'all but itself.' Here the veil is withdrawn, and we behold the man as he is. We have him acknowledging the errors of both sides, seeking to heal the divisions of the past, and inculcating with a holy and a beautiful solicitude, the duty of protecting every name of a former adversary from reproach. As an historical testimony, effectually subversive of all the other statements of Parsons on the subject to which it refers, the letter is highly important, but as an evidence of what nature really is, when unwarped by the prejudices and the passions of party, it assumes even an additional degree of interest."[2]

Another document concerned with the pacification of the

[1] *Tierney*, vol. iii. pp. lxxviii–lxxx. [2] *Ibid.* Note.

English College is a letter to the General, signed by Benne and five others, dated 17th May 1597. This letter wa corrected and interlined in the draft by Parsons himself In it, after praising Parsons for his prudence, charity, mildness dexterity, and success, Aquaviva is asked to allow Parsons t remain in the college, and to have full authority to settle al their affairs according to his prudence.

Writing upon this episode after a few years, Parson makes a characteristic statement, which Tierney criticises a follows:—"With a view to set forth the importance of his ow services in the pacification of the Roman College, he print among other documents, a portion of a letter addressed t him by the General of the Society only a few days befor matters were arranged with the students. In it Aquaviva look forward to a speedy termination of all difficulties; tells Parson that in appeasing the tumults, and reforming the disorders o the college, he will have all the merit of a second founder and then concludes, so Parsons at least assures us, with th following invitation to Naples: 'This Lord Viceroy desireth much to see you here shortly; and I have committed th matter to your own consideration for the time, what will b most convenient' (*Briefe Apologie*, p. 58). To avoid the possi bility of doubt or a mistake, a marginal note is affixed to thi passage, and we are there distinctly informed that the Viceroy alluded to is 'the Comte Olyvares.' Now the original of th letter here cited, which is in Spanish, is at this moment befor me: and will the reader believe that it not only does no contain the passage in question, but that it makes not th most distant allusion to anything of the kind: that neither th Viceroy nor any other person whatsoever is mentioned; an that what is here represented as the great anxiety of a grea man to see him is in reality nothing more than the expressio of a hope on the part of the writer, that he (Parsons) wil continue to employ his piety and prudence in the affair wit which he is entrusted, and in such manner as shall be mos conducive to the great object in view? . . . As almost all th worst charges against the (*Clergy*) rest originally on the autho rity of Parsons, it is necessary to point out these things."[1]

[1] *Tierney*, vol. iii. p. cxlvii. Note.

Parsons, whatever he allowed the students to think, knew well that the dissensions in Rome were only a symptom of a far deeper evil. The affairs of Holt, as will be remembered, had been one of the causes taking him to Rome. The Provincial of Flanders, Manareus, was of decided opinion that those who complained against Holt had cause for so doing. So no sooner was Parsons arrived in Rome than he sent off a letter in Latin (12th April), in which he exposes the real state of the question from his own point of view. The reader will not fail to notice the calm confident tone of absolute conviction in the position Parsons adopts.

". . . I see you have very seriously undertaken the defences of those English who oppose Fr. Holt. Some things you say about the matter I quite agree with, such as these men must not in any way be alienated or exasperated by injuries, revilings, contempt, or show of partiality. I also add that if Hugh Owen has done anything against them, it is fair not only that he should cease, but should also make satisfaction. I say the same of Fr. Holt, of myself, or of any other of ours who should offend in the least against mildness and religious charity. But, on the other side, it is also fair that the case of Hugh Owen as a layman, if he has done any harm, should be separated from the case of ours, and that not everything which Hugh may do or say should be imputed to ours, that is, to men of the Society, although he is our friend and well-wisher. Nor is it fair that Fr. Holt should be asked to give up his friendship because others are angry with him because of an old-standing jealousy. He has done us no harm, but rather on the contrary, and all the governors of Belgium have trusted him, and, as far as I know, nothing can be proved against his fidelity.

"You, many times and throughout your letters, call these men 'noble' who are opposed to Fr. Holt, and the other side you always designate as 'Owen and his followers,' as if the former alone were of noble birth and the latter of mean origin. This is very invidious, and is badly taken by many of our friends who have been up to now most friendly to our Society, and who say that they have observed this in your daily conversation. They think from this that you wish them to be

accounted as mean men, whereas they contend that they—with the exception of the Earl of Westmorland, who has said that he had no quarrel with Fr. Holt, but only with Owen—are more noble by far than the others, or at least their equals. . . .

"The Duke of Feria was formerly of the same opinion as your reverence, but having looked into the matter thoroughly, has changed his opinion, as he told me lately at Barcelona.

"And although you may reply to this argument concerning the conspiracy of the English against the Society, in your letters you seem to think but little of it, I nevertheless appeal to your sense of prudence and fairness, if it is not more probable that you are deceived in this matter, since you have been only mixed up with them these four months, and have believed them rather than us, men of various nations, stations, and places, who for fifteen years have seen and fathomed (*trutinavimus*) their actions. If this does not satisfy you, tell me and I will bring forth such evident proofs to show that they have often spoken unworthy things of our Society, have turned some principal men away from the Society, have caused books to be written against us, and signed memorials and suchlike to our harm. All this I will prove on most convincing evidence, but God knows I don't write all this to turn you away from your offices of kindness and humanity towards those whom I would myself willingly serve if I were there (and so I beseech that the affair may be conducted cautiously, prudently, and without giving offence); but I am led to write thus, lest led away by kindliness and desire of peace (a difficult thing to be arranged with such as they) you should fall into a contrary inconvenience (such as I have seen elsewhere), that is to say, offend our old friends, and not to secure (to the Society at least) the friendship of these new men. It would be a very unworthy thing that ours should be fighting among themselves in opinions and affections, and that these rebellious students, who are inspired thence, should daily split up the whole Society by their disputes, and should boast (as they have begun to do) that some of our own members in Belgium favour them, and that their scheme has caused a schism even among the Jesuits. This makes the

cure all the more difficult, and infinitely increases the evil. And they have begun to spread about these things on account of the new friendship made by your reverence and other fathers with our old enemies, though this is very far from your intention, which I am sure is very good. I have spoken openly of this to you to prevent, if possible, things going on too far.

"Concerning Fr. Holt, the General had already come to a conclusion before I was called here. For many reasons he does not see fit to change him at present, afterwards it will be done more easily," etc.[1]

There was also that troublesome affair of the Cardinalate to be settled one way or the other. When Parsons arrived in Rome, he was visited by certain cardinals of the Spanish party. This gave credit to the reports of his advancement, which his friends had carefully spread in the city. So sure were they of the hat for the head of Parsons that when, shortly after his arrival, being unwell, he wrote to his brother George to send him some scarlet flannel for his private use, it was given out at once that the Jesuit had been nominated cardinal, and his brother ordered merchants in Rome to take to the English College several bales of scarlet material fit for hangings and robes. This mistake caused much annoyance to Parsons, who had to send back the scarlet cloths. More tells us that he went to the Pope, and, telling him the reports that were about the city, besought him with tears not to make him a cardinal. The Holy Father very coldly assured him he had never had the slightest intention of doing so, and that he was not to distress himself about any such rumours, adding, moreover, that the King of Spain had not made any such recommendation in Parsons' favour. So passed this business. One can admire his fidelity to his vow, and at the same time wonder at his simplicity in approaching the Pope on the subject.

To this period we must assign a paper Parsons drew up for giving episcopal Superiors to the Clergy in England, and presented it to the Holy Father. In spite of several attempts to keep up the Succession, the old hierarchy had

[1] *Tierney*, vol. iii. pp. lxxxvi–lxxxix.

been allowed to die out in England; and, owing to the political quarrels between Pope and Queen, the stricken and sorely tried flock, by an extraordinary neglect, had been left without pastors. For thirty-seven years English Catholics had been deprived of bishops; and in 1580 Parsons himself had seen in England how dire was the need.[1] The recent stirs in Wisbeach had brought the necessity more forcibly to the front; and now projects were on foot in England for renewing the petition for bishops. Envoys to Rome for this purpose were spoken of as coming. There was a problem, then, to be faced in the matter. A bishop with ordinary jurisdiction is the master in his diocese, according to the common law of the Church; he would therefore be independent of the Society, which had so nearly, by this time, secured the practical domination in England. And yet Parsons could see the Clergy needed one of themselves to keep them in union and due order. The laity too, were in want of the strengthening effects of the sacrament of confirmation. The difficulties were clear. But how to get out of them? How to obtain a bishop who would not interfere with the monopoly, ecclesiastical and political, Parsons was, at so much toil, on the eve of securing? He solved the problem in this way. Shortly after his arrival in Rome, he drew up a petition to the Pope in the name of the Catholics of England. His recent success in the pacification of the college had given him a great weight with the *Curiâ*; and he stepped into the position of an accepted but unauthorised intermediary. His present scheme, as shown in this petition was as follows:—Having already secured from some of his Spanish friends the promise of pecuniary aid, he suggested that two bishops be appointed—not as ordinaries with English titles, but as bishops *in partibus*. One was to live in England and the other—an archbishop—to live in Belgium. He, in England, besides the special duties of a bishop, such as ordaining and confirming, etc., was "to give counsel in difficult and grave affairs"; "to send authorised and true information to

[1] See p. 68 *ante*. Parsons did not object to a bishop as a sacramental agent but as a ruler, *i.e.* with ordinary jurisdiction.

[2] In the *Briefe Apologie*, p. 102, he expressly claims this plan, however, as his own.

the Pope, the Cardinal Protector, and to other princes upon English affairs"; to place and remove priests as he sees fit, or "the greater glory of God demands." This, Parsons says, will greatly relieve the Jesuits from the burden and odium, "for they, as far as possible, up to the present have looked after the priests in this matter not *ex officio*, but only out of charity," an important admission, by the way, that the Jesuits were governing the Clergy of England. A body of seven or eight assistants, called Archpriests or Archdeacons, were to be appointed as a permanent council—four of these to be nominated by the Pope, and the rest by the bishop, "who will best know who are most fitted for this office." One may ask, if the bishop could know this for one-half of the assistants, why not for the whole? The object of reserving the nomination of four to the Pope was certainly to give Parsons the opportunity of appointing his friends. The archbishop in Belgium was to exercise that external jurisdiction of punishment which could not be exercised in England; he was to oversee and control all informations sent to Rome; to give or withhold faculties for priests going on the mission, so as to prevent any one from going into England without his leave; he was to keep union among the Catholics living in Belgium; and was to have a similar body of assistants. According to Parsons' hierarchical experiment, both bishops were to have jurisdiction over the whole of England, and were to be consecrated in secret, and the whole business got over before the government knew anything about it, so that freedom of egress and ingress should be secured.

But he suddenly changed this plan, owing to important news from England. Checkmated in every attempt to obtain an ordinary, and realising the dangers arising from the disputes at Wisbeach, the older members of the Clergy of England had proposed to form themselves into an Association or Fraternity to regulate the affairs of their body, and be some hindrance to future disputes. It was a pacific measure, and had no opposition to the legitimate privileges of the Jesuits or any other helpers in the mission. Mush and Colleton—two of the oldest and wisest of the Clergy, who had gained the confidence of the rest by their labours, prudence, and self-sacrifice—were the

projectors. In their plan the Clergy were divided into two independent branches—a northern and a southern division—each with its own officers, chosen freely by the members, and each following the same constitution. The chief duties of the Association were to administer the alms which the laity—in spite of the ruinous system of fines—so generously contributed to the support of their Clergy ;[1] and to settle any disputes that might arise.[2] A copy of the Rules, with the title in the handwriting of Garnett, was sent to Parsons, who made a translation of them. So he was fully aware of the real drift of the Association. As he could plainly see, there was absolutely no attempt made at setting up any ruling power independently of Rome; for the original draft states that the Rules were to be submitted to the Apostolic See for confirmation.[3] But the very idea of the Clergy combining for their own advantage, and ruling themselves independently of the Jesuits, could not be tolerated for a moment.[4] Besides, it would be the destruction of the political projects which Parsons thought he had so well planned for securing a Spanish succession when Elizabeth died. A superior they wanted—well, they should have one. But he should be one who should not only "walk in union with and fidelity to the Society," but should be wholly directed by them.

Putting aside, then, his late project, the Presbyterian ideal, which seems to sort well with the Puritan cast of thought, commended itself to him. He represented to the Pope that the English Clergy, for the sake of union, were desirous of having

[1] It will be remembered that the Jesuits had secured the handling of almost all the alms.

[2] Colleton's *Just Defence of the Slandered Priestes*, pp. 123–125.

[3] Dr. Ely's *Certaine Briefe Notes*, p. 107.

[4] In a letter of M. J. (John Mush) to Dr. Bagshawe (8th June or July 1597), the writer refers to the opposition against the proposed Association ; and, speaking of "the fine dealings of the Jesuits which bend themselves thus mightily against our Association," says : "The Jesuits fearing the credit of our confraternity to countervail with theirs will never endure any union of priests, it becometh us to look to it, for unless we seek redress at his hands that can command them, the secular Clergy shall have small credit or estimation with the people or concord among themselves. . . . They are men with whom I think it is most hard to have friendship. Unless one flatter and feed their humours in everything—which I never purpose to do—chiefly (I perceive) they are bent against me. But God grant me His holy grace, and I regard not the worst they can do" (*The Archpriest Controversy*, vol. i. p. 3).

a Superior from their own body. The Pope is reported to have asked if that were the fact, for he would not do anything against the wish of his faithful priests in England, and "willed information to be procured out of England of the fittest men for government."[1] This point was already provided for by Parsons. Garnett had sent to Rome, Father Baldwin, together with a secular priest, Standish by name, who was thoroughly devoted to his interests. These, with other Englishmen, resident in Rome, assured the Pope that such an appointment was the unanimous desire of the Clergy. Letters from Spain and Flanders came also to Rome backing up the application, and assuring the Pontiff that there had never been any dissension between the Clergy and the Jesuits, and that the adverse reports were so far from the truth, that the Jesuits were in all places most notable examples of singular humility, gentleness, patience, piety, and charity. George Blackwell was particularly insistent, and wrote (14th September 1597) to Cardinal Cajetan that if the Clergy had such a Superior, peace would be restored, "and that they would more diligently obey for the future those excellent fathers who are set over them and who deserve so well both of them and all Englishmen"[2]

At an audience, "His Holiness asked Mr. Standish . . . whether the desire to have a Superior as he then informed him was by the consent of all the priests in England or no? who answered it was."[3] Availing himself for the moment of the doctrine of Equivocation, Standish, who had absolutely no such commission, misled the Pope entirely; and afterwards, when accused by his brethren, pleaded that he did but presume on their interpretative desire, "reserving (as since he hath confessed) this to himself: 'as I presuppose or presume.'"[4] Thus misinformed, the Pope committed the business to the Cardinal Protector of the English college—Cajetan—a staunch friend of Parsons. Between the two, a plan was arranged which should meet the views of one at least of the interested

[1] *Briefe Apologie*, p. 99.

[2] Sergeant's *The History and Transactions of the English Chapter* (ed. 1853), pp. 11, 13 (note).

[3] *Certaine Briefe Notes*, p. 133.

[4] *A Sparing Discoverie of our English Jesuits*, p. 11.

parties. As to the desires of the Clergy in this most important matter, Parsons says: "They being so small a part as they were of the whole body, it was not necessary in particular for His Holiness or Protector to require the same."[1] After events showed how imprudently Parsons had estimated both the number and importance of those he thus contemptuously pushed aside.[2]

Going back to a former plan, it was decided by Parsons to institute an Archpriest over the Clergy in England.[3] The man was to hand. George Blackwell, a former student of the English College at Rome, was of a sufficiently pliable nature, and was, as Parsons says, "well united in love and judgment with the Jesuits."[4] To him the Protector wrote on 7th March 1598, and appointed him Archpriest over the Clergy, "to direct, admonish, reprehend, even to chastise when necessary, and this by restriction of their faculties, obtained no matter where from, or even by revocation if so needed."[5] Cajetan appointed by name six assistants (one of whom was Standish), and authorises the Archpriest to choose six others.[6]

The expressed intention of such an appointment is, says

[1] *Briefe Apologie*, p. 107.

[2] It appeared afterwards that only some fifty-seven out of three hundred of the Clergy sympathised with the Jesuits.

[3] More, the historian, sometimes makes indiscreet admissions. Speaking of the institution of the Archpriest, and of Parsons' connection with the business, he says: "There is no doubt that Parsons' judgment was asked in the matter" (*Historia*, p. 147); and then defends it. "What does it indeed matter how or upon whose information the Pontiff acts? Jethro, a gentile man it was who gave Moses the advice of appointing the elders" (p. 148). The Pope termed it "Parsons' subordination" (*Archpriest Controversy*, ii. p. 194). Cardinal Borghese told Mush and Champney (30th June 1602) "that he would witness that the Archpriest was made wholly at Fr Parsons' instance" (*ibid.* p. 16). And Colleton bears witness that Signor Acrisio stated that the Pope told him "that the new superiority was not instituted by His Holiness' command" (*A Just Defence of the Slandered Priestes*, p. 34). Considering Clement VIII.'s feeling towards the Society, this seems most likely to be the case.

[4] *Briefe Apologie*, p. 8. [5] See the letter in full, *Tierney*, vol. iii. pp. cxix–cxxiii.

[6] In an information (S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. (Addenda), vol. 34, No. 42), given by an intelligencer, there is an account of the appointment of the Archpriest. "The other six (assistants) Blackwell to appoint at his pleasure, and such especially as may have the opportunity to reside about London. And these are bound and charged by the authority given them to write to the Pope and to the Protector every six months of all the affairs in England, and oftener as occasion requires; but there is scarce any week but they write to Parsons. Their letters passeth by divers conveyances, and with such cautions, as for my life I could never come to the intercepting of any of them

the Cardinal, among other objects, to assure "peace and union of minds and concord between brothers and priests, namely, also with the fathers of the Society of Jesus who labour with you in the same vineyard. . . . Since they have not, nor pretend to have any jurisdiction or power over the secular Clergy, nor interfere with them in any way,[1] it is clearly the craft of the enemy and deceit of the devil for the overthrow of all the work in England, that any Catholic should excite or practise emulation against them; since, on the other hand, they ought to be rather held in all love and reverence as they, with the greater alacrity overwhelm priests and the rest, as heretofore, with good offices, benefits, and paternal charity, so that all being united, the most holy work may be furthered."

This disclaimer of any intention of the Jesuits to rule ecclesiastical affairs in England is clearly Parsons'. He protests too much. The more clearly to prove what was one of the real objects in view, the Protector sent with this public letter separate instructions to Blackwell, ordering him upon all subjects of importance concerning his office to consult with the Superior of the Jesuits in England. The private instructions were: "Although the Superior of the said fathers is not among the consulters of the Archpriest, yet since it is of the greatest importance, and is the earnest desire and command of His Holiness that there should be complete union of mind and agreement between the fathers of the Society and the secular Clergy, and as the said Superior, on account of his experience of English affairs and the authority he has among Catholics, may greatly assist all consultations of the Clergy, the Archpriest will be careful in matters of greater moment to ask his judgment and counsel so that everything may be directed in an orderly manner with greater light and peace to the glory of God." This upset all the good that might have

albeit I have used therein no small vigilance." Any doubt as to the possibility of keeping up a regular and frequent correspondence in those days of penal laws, is at once set aside by a perusal of the letters which exist so abundantly in manuscript and print. There were regular ports established which brought letters every week to Parsons. "Thomas Paynes, a haberdasher over against the Counter, in the Poultry," was a receiving house for Parsons' correspondence. See his letter, S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 241, No. 411.

[1] *Nec ullam illis molestiam exhibere.*

come from an office such as that of the Archpriest, and was the cause of much future dissension.

This letter, making a new office in the Church, was not the exercise of the supreme power of the Pope. It was the action of the Cardinal Protector of the English college. Cajetan says he is "following the kind and provident will of His Holiness." Later on, when the exigencies of the moment demanded an argument, Parsons does not hesitate to quote Cajetan as saying he acted in the institution "by the special command of the Pope."[1] Upon which Dr. Ely remarks: "Although he repeat this very often and urge it greatly, yet is it a very fiction without any good ground or probability."[2] A few years later (31st May 1602), Robert Parkinson, Allen's confessor—a grave priest and reader at Rheims—gives his opinion in these terms: "If God spare me health and life . . . I will write to Father Parsons concerning many complaints that I have heard of his hard dealings with our youths at Rome, and likewise of the new erection of the Archpriest in England. It was thought of long before Father Parsons began it; and by Gregory the 13th suppressed and forbidden as a jurisdiction which could not be practised in England. I suppose Father Parsons did it with good intentions, etc. But by experience and contradiction he should have foreseen the mischief that was likely to follow, and sought means how to prevent it rather than by force and authority to force it out."[3]

But we must not anticipate.

Another point concerning English ecclesiastical affairs Parsons at this time arranged to his satisfaction. University degrees were held in high esteem in England; and some of the students from the seminaries had, after leaving, obtained degrees in foreign universities. It was a continual source of annoyance to the Clergy that students were not presented for degrees while at the seminaries. "They (the Jesuits) never sent any from that college (Rome) into England with any degree of schools at their back, two only excepted, who were specially favoured and loved of Fr. Alphonso (Agazzari)

[1] *Apologie*, p. 102. [2] *Op. cit.* p. 4.
[3] Introduction to *Certaine Briefe Notes* (no pagination).

were made doctors in Rome before their mission, yet neither of them went into England, but were both stayed at Rheims."[1] This was a part of what seems, by the logic of events, to have been Parsons' fixed plan. His schemes must, we contend, be judged not by words but by actions, which, according to his own dictum, "have the truest weight of affection or disaffection."

Knowledge and the higher studies were seen to be an inconvenience in the hands of the Clergy. They were to be only hewers of wood and drawers of water; or, putting it into more modern form, the men for whom Hay's *Sincere Christian* and the *Catechismus ad parochos* are the books.[2] Their intellectual status was to be quietly lowered, while, on the other hand, all knowledge, with its accompanying power, was to be kept in the hands of those whom, as we have seen, Sega styles advisers of the people, guides of the Clergy, salt of the earth, and sun of the heavens of the English Church. At this present moment Parsons, taking advantage of some having "by licence of juvenile presumption and temerity" procured degrees from minor universities, perhaps without sufficient examination, contented himself with obtaining a breve which forbade any seminarist to take degrees without the permission of the superiors of his college. There is the real point of the order; requiring a fit course of study previous to taking a degree is only a specious condition. Had one found the cause of higher education of the Clergy zealously pursued by the Jesuits, this breve would have been praiseworthy, and Parsons credited with a useful measure. But the logic of events prove, as we said, the real significance of a document which caused afterwards so much dispute. Though dated 19th September 1597, it was not printed till three years after.

Another step gained in this same direction was the influence Parsons now got over Dr. Worthington, one of the professors and afterwards to be rector of Allen's seminary. Worthington, as we have said, bound himself by vow, made in the hands of the Jesuit rector of Louvain, to fulfil whatsoever it might seem

[1] Ely, p. 85. The two were Dr. Barrett, who succeeded Allen as President, and Dr. Stillington, whose presence at Douai was disastrous to the welfare of that college.

[2] Purcell's *Life of Cardinal Manning*, vol. ii. p. 762.

good to Parsons to enjoin. He wrote (10th January 1597) to him acquainting him with what he had done; and protested that should the Jesuit refuse to accept the vow, he would still "endeavour to follow your inclination, so far as I can learn it, in all mine action of importance. . . . It is to me no new yoke; for I was at your commandment ever since (1579) . . . I request . . . that you will assign me some by whom I shall be directed here, or in any other place distant from you and in your absence. In the meantime I suppose you will have me to take and follow Father Holt's direction as your own, etc."[1] This vow of obedience was subsequently made use of by Parsons who, when Dr. Barrett died, rewarded the confidence by appointing Worthington president of the seminary.[2] By this means he at last attained the full control over all the seminaries in which the English Clergy were educated; and, through Dr. Worthington, was able to lower the standard of learning in Allen's famous college.

While these delicate affairs were being managed by Parsons —affairs that would require the whole attention of any ordinary man—he did not lose sight of the other object that had brought him to Rome. He was working at his political plans as though with undivided attention; and was engaged in encountering the obstacles they were meeting with in Flanders. Charles Paget and Dr. Giffard were occupying much of his attention. On 30th June 1597, Parsons writes a long letter to Don Juan d'Idiaquez, the King of Spain's Secretary, upon "The faction of Charles Paget and Thomas Morgan, the source of much past and present injury to the cause of His Majesty in England." The paper, even at the risk of some slight repetition, deserves reproduction in these pages. It was intended to back up the former communications of Englefield and the Duke of Feria on the same subject.

[1] See the whole letter in *Tierney*, vol. v. pp. iv–vi.

[2] This custom of receiving vows of obedience may be illustrated by a passage in a letter of Garnett to Anne Vaux (Foley's *Records*, vol. iv. p. 109): "If you like to stay here, then I exempt you till a Superior be appointed whom you may acquaint, but tell him that you made your vow of yourself, and then told me, and that I limited certain conditions, as that you are not bound under sin except you be commanded *in virtute obedientiae*; we may accept no vows. But men may make them as they list, and we after give directions accordingly."

"The circumstance of some of His Majesty's servants having mistaken or disregarded the factious proceedings of these two men, has already been the occasion of no slight injury both to the cause of the Catholics and to the interests of His Majesty in England; and that still greater injury is likely to result from a want of attention to their designs in future will be readily understood from the following facts.

"The origin of their estrangement may be traced to the year 1582, when at a meeting at Paris attended by the Nuncio, the Spanish ambassador, John Baptist de Taxis, the Duke of Guise, the Archbishop of Glasgow as ambassador from the Queen of Scots, and others, it was determined that the conversion of England should rest solely on the support of the King of Spain,[1] and, in pursuance of this resolution, the Fathers Parsons and Creighton were ordered to proceed, the former to Lisbon, the latter to Rome, in order to obtain certain assistance for Scotland. From this meeting Paget and Morgan, who were residing in France as the agents of the Scottish Queen, were excluded. Irritated at the affront, they applied to two of the Queen's secretaries with whom they corresponded, Nan, a Frenchman, and Curle, a native of Scotland, who both resided with her in England, who possessed her cypher and held considerable sway in her councils; and they so far influenced the views of these men that the four in conjunction speedily contrived to alienate the mind of the unhappy Queen, and destroy her confidence in the scheme thus set on foot for the employment of Spain. In proof of this we have the still living testimony of Father Henry Samerie, a French Jesuit, who now resides in Flanders, and who, at the period in question, living with the Queen in England in character of her physician, was privy to all that passed. The fact was also attested by the Duke of Guise in his lifetime, who said, with much concern, to several persons, and particularly to his confessor, Father Claude Mathew Loranes of the Society of Jesus, to Father Parsons and some others, that through the instrumentality of Paget and Morgan, who had represented him as the

[1] It was rather, as has been seen, that the King of Spain should be asked to support the young Scotch King in hopes of his future conversion, and in furtherance of his mother's claim.

sworn creature of Spain and of the Jesuits, he himself in a certain transaction had been wholly deprived of the Queen's confidence.

"In addition to this it is a known fact that these men more than once endeavoured to persuade the Duke of Guise to undertake the task of liberating the Scottish Queen and placing her on the throne of England and Scotland, to the exclusion of the Spaniards; and that upon the Duke's refusing to comply with this request, and resolving in 1583 once more to solicit the assistance of the King of Spain, Charles Paget, unable to prevent the accomplishment of this determination, offered to go to England and induce the Earl of Northumberland to join the Duke. On his arrival, however, his whole endeavour was to dissuade the Earl from the project, as the Duke himself afterwards mentioned to several. In fact, Paget, when on the point of embarking for England, had himself secretly informed William Watts, an English priest, of his intention to adopt this course; and not only Father Samerie, but also several others inform us, that both he and Morgan so influenced the Scottish Queen herself by their letters, that she wrote to the Earl, forbidding him in any way to join either the Duke of Guise or the Spaniards in the proposed enterprise. Such was the conduct of Paget and Morgan even after their reconciliation in Paris with the Duke of Guise, Dr. Allen, and Father Parsons, who, for the sake of peace and union, and in order to prevent further intrigues, had admitted them to a participation in all their secrets. That they never afterwards proved faithful to their new alliance will appear from the following facts:

"After this first act of treason, in the case of the Earl of Northumberland, an act which led ultimately to the destruction of that nobleman, they were daily engaged in opposing by every possible means, but especially through the instrumentality of the Scottish Queen herself, whom they had now gained over, whatsoever was sought to be accomplished by the opposite party, for the benefit of that princess and for the common cause, through the intervention of Spain. In justification of their conduct they complained, as they still complain, that Allen, Parsons, Englefield, and others of that party refused to

communicate with them on the concerns of the Queen of Scots, in which, as her servants, they were more particularly concerned; and to remove this ground of dissention, Allen and Parsons, in the year 1584, came once more to Paris, intending to renew their friendship with the parties, and at the same time to acquaint them again with the situation of affairs. It was at the moment that the baron Paget, brother of Charles, had arrived from England. By his influence it was hoped that both Charles and Morgan might be gained over; the reverse, however, occurred; for the baron was converted to their party.

"Another instance of their treasonable conduct was that at the very time they were treating with the Duke of Guise, Allen and Parsons, to procure a supply of troops from Spain, of the speedy arrival of which there was every probability, they secretly sent to England a certain spy named William Parry, who had been many years employed by the Queen of England in Italy and elsewhere. This man, as we learn from his published confessions, immediately disclosed to the Queen whatever had passed; and moveover told her that he was commissioned, when the proper time should arrive, to murder her, to place the Scottish Queen on the throne, and thus to prevent the Spanish invasion which was promoted by the Jesuits. The Queen, though at the time she expressed her gratitude and bestowed rewards on him, subsequently ordered him to be executed. Such was the end of Dr. Parry.

"Afterwards these two men were for some time engaged in rendering the name of a Spanish invasion hateful in the eyes of all, by applying it to every species of succour or support which was proffered through the medium of Spain. Allen, Parsons, Englefield, all who approved the Spanish plan or advocated that mode of relief, they designated as confederates of the Spaniards, anxious for the conquest and the ruin of the country. Thus they continued to attract odium to their adversaries and at the same time to swell the number of their own party. But that which tended most effectually to increase their adherents was a declaration which they published that the Queen of Scots herself was equally opposed to the invasion and to its abettors; and that she

would avail herself of any species of relief, in preference to the intervention of Spanish troops, as proposed by the Jesuits. To this effect in reality the Queen herself wrote to the Duke of Guise in 1585, directing him to keep a watchful eye on the proceedings of the Jesuits as connected with any plan of Spanish interposition; and taking an opportunity at the same time *to reprehend the Duke and the Archbishop of Glasgow for having omitted to supply a certain sum of money on the petition of Morgan and Paget to a certain young gentleman in England, who, in consideration of the reward, had promised them, so they persuaded Her Majesty, to murder the Queen of England. The fact was that the Duke and the Archbishop understood that the party in question (his name is here omitted because he is still living)*[1] *was a worthless fellow and would do nothing as it eventually turned out; and on this account refused to provide the money. Yet for this it was that Paget and Morgan induced the Queen to reprehend them.*[2]

. . . . . .

"Although to some these differences among the English may appear of little moment as affecting but few individuals in comparison with the whole Catholic body, yet experience proves that they are productive of the most injurious and of course the most important consequences. They keep, in fact, a considerable part of the nation in a divided and distracted state; while numbers of young Englishmen, leaving their country with the best intentions, but falling into the hands of these seditious parties, receive impressions of which they can never afterwards divest themselves, until not only they, but others with them, are involved in ruin; becoming eventually enemies, spies, apostates, heretics, falling from one misfortune to another,[3] and thus exhibiting a daily evidence of the effects

[1] In the margin of the MS. the initials J. G. are written.

[2] Not one word of reprobation escapes Parsons upon this plot. Mary was evidently engaged in it, and the complicity of both the Duke and Archbishop is beyond a doubt.

[3] It is only well to remember that these hard names were very freely used by Parsons of all who opposed him. And often men are driven by desperation into an attitude of defiance of legitimate authority by the extravagant assertions and claims of those who make themselves exponents of this authority, and claim for their interpretation of the acts of authority an equal weight with the authority itself.

of these associations. Hence it especially behoves His Majesty and his ministers to keep a watchful eye on this band of restless and impracticable spirits before their numbers and their power increase. If this be neglected, inconveniences will arise, which will not easily admit of a remedy; and the reduction of England will become more difficult in consequence of the dissensions which these men are producing among the Catholics. Indeed, the little attention hitherto directed to this party has been the source of no small injury both to the welfare of England and to the interests of His Majesty; and the longer the application of the remedy is delayed the greater will be the mischief that will necessarily ensue. Were one or two of the leaders to be removed from Flanders or publicly deprived of their pensions as factious members of the community, the rest of the party might take warning and others might be deterred from joining them; but if this, or some similar demonstration, be not made on the part of His Majesty and his ministers, I see no prospect of a termination to this business. May our Lord obtain what is most expedient. 30th June 1597."[1]

On 20th December of that same year Parsons tried what could be done by a personal appeal to Paget, and wrote the following letter:—

"All Englishmen know that these aversions and disagreements of yours are no new things, but of many years . . . For you will remember yourself that about fourteen years ago, when you and I dealt together first in the city of Rouen in France, you showed yourself no less disgusted than now, when yet neither Father Holt nor Mr. Owen were near you or gave you any molestation, but that then all your complaint was against priests in general and against Mr. Doctor Allen (after Cardinal) in particular and by name, about whom you and I had long disputes why he or other priests or religious men should meddle in public matters of our country, and not you gentlemen, meaning yourself and Mr. Morgan, for that other gentlemen of worship then present in France, as Mr. Charles Arundell, Mr. William Tresham, Mr. Thomas Fitzherbert, Mr. Fulgiam, Mr. James Hill, Mr. Hopkings, Mr. Tinstead, and

[1] *Endorsed by Parsons.* Concerning the partiality of Paget and Morgan among the English nation, 1597. *Tierney*, vol. iii. pp. lix–lxvii.

others complained not of that point, but took part rather against you in that very quarrel which you endeavoured to raise between gentlemen and priests, repeating often (as I well remember) why priests did not meddle with their breviaries only, and the like. And I answering you that if the priests besides their breviaries, or with their breviaries, or by their credit in Catholic princes' courts, where breviary men were esteemed, could help and assist and serve you gentlemen also towards the reduction of our country, why should you not be content to use their labours to your and the public commodity without emulation? Upon this you cannot but remember also how careful Mr. Dr. Allen and I did endeavour at that time to yield satisfaction both to my Lord Paget, your brother then newly come over, and to yourself, and to Mr. Morgan making a journey of purpose for that cause to Paris, and lying in your own house and imparting all our affairs and secrets with you, and how you broke from us again by your secret sending of Dr. Parry into England without our knowledge though we were present; which Parry revealed all (as the world knoweth) and more unto the Queen (though as I presume not by your wills or commission in this point); and yet how after this we made a new composition and atonement again with you in the same city of Paris, where it was concluded that you should go to England and I to Rome, and that this league was broken again by you and not by us and upon the defeat of all the designments by that your journey and especially upon the revelation and oath of Mr. Watts, the priest, who both affirmed to the Duke of Guise, to Father Claude Mathew, his confessor, Dr. Allen, and to myself that you had told him in secret at the sea's side when you were to embark, that you meant in England to overthrow all our endeavours, and so the effect showed; and yet you knew that, notwithstanding all this, our desires of peace and union were so great that in the year '86,[1] a little before our going to Rome together, Mr. Dr. Allen and I made a third accord with you and Mr. Morgan, and desired the continuance of the same, as among others Mr. Ligons, which was the last man which brought us in our way from the Spa, can partly testify

[1] 1585?

with what minds we departed in this behalf, whom we desired to do his best also to the same effect with you in Flanders after our departure. But we being in Rome you cannot forget how you and your friends continued your treaties with Solomon Aldred that came in and out of England to Paris from the Council, and professed himself opposite to our proceedings. The sending also into England of Ballard and Savage without our privities or even writing one syllable thereof unto us, though the one were a priest thereby subject to Dr. Allen. Afterwards in like manner your dealings with Gilbert Giffard and Grattley, other two priests, were kept secret from us, as also their treaties in England with the enemy, their writing of two infamous books against Dr. Allen, Jesuits, and Spaniards, whereof ensued the general and particular hurts that all men knew; those matters (I say) and others like passed in Paris among you and your secret friends alone without any knowledge of ours or rather any participation (I daresay) of any of those noble and gentlemen that now you name participant of your affairs and disagreements against us. And after this again the seditious proceedings of Mr. Morgan, as appeareth by his letters to the Bishop of Dunblane,[1] in the year 1589, and of the Prior Arnold [2] in Spain against our Lord Cardinal, as is evident by the Prior's own letters to the said Morgan in the same year; whereof you could not be ignorant or at leastwise cannot be so presumed in reason, your intrinsical conjunction with them being such as it was, which dealing my Lord Cardinal in his letters to yourself yet extant in the year 1591 affirmeth plainly to be traitors to the public cause. . . ."[3]

[1] William Chisholm resigned his See and became a Carthusian in 1586; then became Prior of the Certosa in Rome, and died 1593.

[2] Prior of the English Carthusians in Flanders.

[3] From Stonyhurst MS. See *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. ii. pp. 391–4. Paget, writing 10th June 1598, says: "I was never a favourite of theirs because I have ever misliked the courses of Father Parsons and Holt, and have not only told them plainly thereof but advertised the Cardinals and the Pope the same, which has made them proceed with great fury against me and some others. Let the Queen be assured that the Jesuits cannot abide to hear of peace, and especially between her and the King of Spain, as it will be the break up of all the plots and practices for England of which I hope to discover some before long and to diminish their credit in all parts." S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. (Addenda), vol. 33, No. 97.

Paget was an enemy of one sort. Dr. William Giffard w an opponent of another calibre. Gentle, pious, learned, a charitable, he was, on the Continent, the one in whom all w were aggrieved at the state of affairs confided. He w respected by the Nuncio, and in favour of the Archduke co manding the Low Countries. He held the office of Dean St. Peter's Church at Lille.[1] His case had to be met in qu another way than Charles Paget's, and a pitiful story it is tell. Suffice it here to say, use was made in Rome of a m named Fisher, whom Parsons himself calls "one of the m exorbitant disorderly fellows in the Roman stirs."[2] Fish it appears, had drawn up and dispersed in England a memor to the Pope, which he had written against the Jesuit, in t name of the Clergy of England. This memorial was ascrib by the Jesuits to Dr. Giffard;[3] and they drew up and circulat in MS. the heads of the accusations with references to lett written by Giffard to his friends.[4] They were now able appear to advantage as the aggrieved party; and a defe written by Garnett was sent, March 1598, "to all the pri to whom these letters shall come." Whether this circu was meant to reach all of the Clergy may be doubted. Garn says that the injury done to the Society by this memorial little compared with what will result to the Clergy; and goes on to suggest an opportune remedy ("if it so seems

[1] In a paper of information concerning English Catholics on the Continent (S. P. Dom. Eliz. (Addenda), vol. 34, No. 42), the informant speaks thus of Dr. Giffa "Mr. Dr. Giffard, dean thereof (Lille), and I protest I take him for an honest m and a well-wisher to his country, for that no Englishman what condition soeve be of but (he) doth relieve him and give him money in his purse, and procureth a pass to depart quietly through the country, and therefore and for other occasions Jesuits cannot endure him, but continual hatred is amongst them for their unla proceedings."

[2] *Briefe Apologie*, p. 93.

[3] "I would fain know of this honest father if Master Dr. Giffard were acces hereto, how chanced it then that Master Blackwell, our Archpriest, publicly be witnesses cleared him, affirming that he was not author thereof" (*A Reply*, p. 19

[4] There is extant no complete copy of the memorial, as far as I can find. Abstr were drawn up in manuscript, and circulated by the Jesuits. Dr. Bagshawe in *True Relation* prints one of these entitled "*An Abstract of the Memorial sent by cer Englishmen out of the Low Countries to the Pope's Holiness, Clement VIII., against Jesuits labouring in the English Vineyard, September* 1597." I do not see any re to doubt the genuineness of the letters quoted. Dr. Giffard knew how to hit har

your prudence"), namely, that ten or twenty or more from each province should subscribe to a document in their favour which should be sent to the Protector; and he thus meets a likely difficulty some might experience in signing such a document. "But although to some of you we are not familiarly known, so that perchance all would not wish to say that everything (in the memorial) was false, there are three ways in which such an answer may be made. Some can say that they knew all to be false, others that they have nothing to accuse us of, others can with a safe conscience at least affirm they never thought of such a memorial, neither had they any part nor did they approve thereof. . . . If my purgation be not suspected among you, I call God and His angels to witness that there is not a particle of truth in what we are accused of. . . . This (document) I wish by you, and especially so by you, to be set forth, that the laity should know nothing about it (unless your prudence suggests otherwise), or that copies be kept of these calumnies."[1] We shall see later what value is to be ascribed to the disclaimers of Garnett.

One of the three copies in the Petyt MSS. is described as *Articuli patris Personii contra D. Giffordum decanum Insulensem.* The truth seems to be this: Parsons was too willingly deceived by Fisher. Dr. Ely refers to the matter in these terms: "Fisher, this miserable fellow, coming to Rome after the stirs in the college were happily finished, he was caught by the back in Rome by those against whom he had written and dispersed the oft-named memorial *written in Dr. Griffith's his house in Cambray*, and so put into the hands of the officer of His Holiness. The miserable fellow being apprehended, and fearing the galleys or the gallows, to save his life and limbs was ready to swear and forswear, and to write and speak *placentia*, that is to say, such things as he knew would best please the offended persons and by which he might obtain for himself pardon and liberty."[2] On the testimony of such a witness (of whom Parsons could not help writing, "Albeit we will not affirm all to be true which he said, yet many things are such as could not be well feigned and are confirmed otherwise, and the speaking voluntarily upon his oath must be

[1] *Archpriest Controversy*, i. p. 19. [2] *Certaine Briefe Notes*, p. 156.

presumed to have had some care also of his conscience"),[1] th attack was made upon Dr. Giffard. Parsons, although usin such an instrument, knew very well that Giffard had set hin self up as a rock in the way. His opposition was open, an he did not try to disguise it.

That Giffard was willing to work with Parsons as far his conscience would allow, is clear from the following corr spondence. But he would not allow himself to be mixed u with any treasonable practices under guise of religion. Th determination was the real cause of the quarrel, and it is n wonder that Giffard felt and expressed himself warmly o the subject. Writing to Parsons from Brussels (20th Marc 1597), he says:

". . . And truly as in my last to you two years since so this, I do lament with all my heart the division and dissensi which is betwixt those of our nation, and as I would endeavo by all means to bring them to union and concord, knowin the woeful and lamentable effects which this schism and di cord hath bred both here and in other parts, so my conscien doth not accuse me that I have given any occasion there whatever the good knight[2] of blessed memory by wro information had conceived of me, which I doubt not but ever we had met I could easily have taken out of his min Truth it is I never was of the humour to rail either again some noblemen and gentlemen in these parts, or to char the scholars of Rome with horrible and enormous crimes heresy, whoredom, sodomy, enmity to His Catholic Majes and such like, and in all places and companies to cry out a exclaim against them as men worthy (of) expulsion, galle prisons, degradation and the like, being not able to prove a such thing against them; and therefore I judged it mo secure in conscience to suspend my judgment and bridle n tongue until I saw His Holiness' censure and sentence, th with the vulgar and unbridled tongues to lavish rash against them whatever was suggested by every private ma and this, perhaps, may be some motive why some men ha conceived of me as an abettor and favourer of those Rom broils; but I trust a man of your virtue and wisdom will n

[1] *Briefe Apologie*, p. 95.

[2] Sir Francis Englefield.

make that an argument of any my inordinate affection in those troubles. . . . For joining with you in one and the same course to serve and help our country, I am as desirous as he that is most, and if that course consist in priestly functions of teaching, preaching, sacrificing and the like, I am, as you know, not now to begin that course, having to God's honour and the profit of many spent all my younger years therein. But if it consists in anything else, when I shall know your authority of Pope or prince to commence any such course, I will to the uttermost of my power join with you; yea, if it should proceed from your private judgment and zeal of souls, when you shall vouchsafe to make me partaker of it, I will assist you with all I can, nothing doubting but that your course will be founded in reason and religion; and if in the mean season in word or affection I differ perhaps from your course, blame me not, but yourself that never vouchsafed to make me privy to it neither more or less."[1]

In another letter written from Lille (13th December 1597), Giffard, after speaking in warm terms of Parsons' good work for the seminaries, and assuring him of his co-operation, goes on to say:

"But if you require conjunction with you in other matters which your wisdom and experience perhaps find fit for the reformation of our afflicted country, I will desire you that I may rather be a looker-on than to farre to engage myself in such weighty matters wherein I am wholly ignorant, and which may, by the inconstant course of this world, as well ruin as advance the authors and actors, etc."[2]

This spirit did not suit Parsons. He would not listen to reason, but took for granted all the calumnies reported of Giffard. The following letter betrays his strange state of mind. It could not be admitted to an outsider that he or one of "ours" could be in the wrong. He says: "And now, sir, I see but two ways for you to choose; the one to set yourself to prove these things that you have avouched of our fathers, if you can; or else to give some satisfaction to them, laying the fault upon mistaking information or the like. But the best

[1] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. i. pp. 395, 396.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 397.

satisfaction of all would be to leave off this course of contra diction, and to attend to peace and union in our nation fo the time to come; for that our divisions are odious to Go and man; and none can abide now to hear of them or of an that will foster them."[1]

But as this exhortation did not move Giffard from th position he had taken up, accusation was made against hi before the Nuncio of Flanders, who thoroughly examined int all the charges, and declared the accused innocent. Th failing, Parsons wrote to Baldwin to make an end with th doctor, and in any case to procure peace with him. "Fathe Baldwin, a man of the right stamp, dealt with the Nuncio fo a general pacification and reunion on all sides; whereunto th doctor at the Nuncio his entreaty yielded. And first, b order taken in that behalf, the said Baldwin, in the name of F Parsons and all that Society, asked his forgiveness; and th doctor for his part in civility performed as much; with th addition, if he had offended any of them. Which being don the Nuncio commanded them both to be secret of what ha passed in favour indeed of the Jesuits, which commandme the doctor obeyed; but Fr. Baldwin omitting what he ha done in the name of the rest instantly gave it forth after glorious sort, that the doctor had asked Fr. Parsons' and th Jesuits' forgiveness. And thereby to disgrace him anew an make their former injuries done unto him more probable, th caused the same to be openly promulgated out of the pulp in the college at Rheims. So shameless (you see) they a as the very pulpits are profaned by them; when it stande them in hand to maintain their reputation *per fas aut nef* they care not how."[2]

[1] *Remarks on a book entitled "Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani,"* by Rev. Cha Plowden, p. 109, note.

[2] *A Sparing Discoverie*, pp. 30, 31. The story is corroborated by Dr. Ely. I letter written by the Nuncio to Parsons (26th September 1598) it appears t Giffard was the only one to apologise. In view of the very explicit statement the text, and corroborated as it is by Dr. Ely, we must bear in mind that the Nun was a particular friend of Giffard, and very likely in writing to Parsons only said w was necessary to soothe the angry feelings of the Jesuit. Diplomatists do not alw tell the whole truth. I must express my gratitude to the Librarian of the Nati Library of Naples for his kindness in transcribing for me the text of the lette Parsons, which exists among the manuscripts of that Library.

This attack against Giffard failing, Parsons had to hold his hand for a more favourable opportunity, which did present itself some years after. But he had achieved his position. His hand was on all English affairs, and he was in a fair way to crush all opposition. Fisher, the author of the memorial, was exiled by Parsons into Spain, to be out of the way of inconvenient questioners. One last step was attained. For the second time he became Rector of the English college at Rome (November 1598), and held the post till his death.

Before concluding this chapter, it may be interesting to see the attitude of the English laity, whose right, Parsons and Holt, *more hispanico*, were altogether ignoring, whilst exploiting them for the advancement of their own ends. The following letter to Burghley puts the matter into a very clear light. The writer is anonymous, but the date is 24th August 1597:—

"From my infancy I have been a Catholic, but never an enemy of my country, and, albeit I had some dealings with the Queen of Scotland, for which I was called in question, yet never intended to prejudice the Queen's Majesty's most royal person. Notwithstanding my return from Milan, and forsaking the King of Spain's service, I was not suffered to enjoy the liberty of my conscience privately, nor the benefit of the law in causes of justice. I was utterly ruined; and considering the sentence against me in the Star Chamber about Sir Thomas Stanhope's weirs,[1] and the troubles both my wife and I were presently to fall into by reason of recusancy, being bound to appear before the Archbishop of York, I was forced again to abandon the realm, but, I thank God, I have never yet entered into any conspiracy against Her Majesty or my country. Arriving at Flanders, I sought to the King of Spain and his governors in the Low Countries for maintenance, but found that one Parsons, an English Jesuit, had gotten that interest in the King and his Council in Spain, and another English Jesuit, Holt, had gotten by Parsons' means such credit in the Court of Flanders, as that none of our nation could obtain anything in either place but by their

[1] From a paper in the Record Office concerning this case, it is possible that the writer of this letter may be either George Blount or George Holt.

means. They will favour none but such as will follow their faction,[1] whereunto I could not yield, though I desire the conversion of our country to the Catholic Faith. Having made trial of Holt divers ways, I found him to be a most wicked, monstrous man, and the course they run, to tend to the ruin of our country, overthrow of the monarchy, destruction of the nobility, and to bring England into perpetual bondage to the Spaniards. They neither respect religion, their native soil, nor anything else except their own most ambitious humour, hoping to attain to special authority and government under the King of Spain. Wherefore, though I had entertainment offered me, I came away from Brussels and retired me to Liege, out of the King of Spain's dominions. For the rest I would venture my life in defence of Her Majesty and my country, against any stranger who should invade the realm.

"Without liberty of conscience I will never return; but if I might have some maintenance out of my country I will live in any Catholic place out of the King of Spain's dominions, and do Her Majesty from time to time any service I can. If Her Majesty would have a gracious respect to the Earl of Westmoreland, whereby he might have some honourable means from her to maintain him, I could persuade him to retire from the King of Spain, which would greatly impor Her Majesty's service. England, I know, standeth in mos dangerous terms to be a spoil to all the world, and to be brought into perpetual bondage, and that, I fear, your lordship and the rest of the Council will see when it is too late. Would to God, therefore, Her Majesty would grant toleration o religion, whereby men's minds would be appeased and join al in one for the defence of our country. We see what safety it hath been to France, how peaceable the kingdom of Poloni is where no man's conscience is forced, how the Germans live being contrary in religion, without giving offence one t another. Why might not we do the like in England, seein

[1] *Anthony Rolston to the Earl of Essex and Sir Robert Cecil:* "You may thin the worst of me because I have depended of Fathers Parsons and Creswell. But, matters go in Spain, it is impossible for any Englishman to remain in any part Spain that will not depend of them. And God knows, without their favour, it ha gone hard with me." *Historical MSS. Commission, Hatfield MSS.*, Part VII. p. 18

REGNORUM ET PROVINCIARUM PER SOCIETATEM CONVERSIO

An emblematical picture from the Jesuit work, Imago Primi Saeculi Societatis Jesu

every man must answer for his own soul at the Latter Day, and that religion is the gift of God and cannot be beaten into a man's head with a hammer? Well may men's bodies be forced but not their minds, and where force is used, love is lost, and the prince and state endangered. . . . Liege, 24th August 1597." [1]

Parsons was now at the zenith of his career. Not a cardinal himself, he was able to move some of the Sacred College, and even the Pope himself, as so many chess-men upon the board of his schemes. But his influence with the latter was more indirect. Working under cover, Parsons obtained most of his triumphs through the Spanish ambassador, and thus gave an importance to his projects which they would not have had of themselves. Given a free hand by his General, for a few months he reigned supreme. Surely to himself Predestination was justified: for did not the Elect now possess the land? This conviction seems to have extended itself also to the Englishmen who gathered round him in Rome, and who were devoted to the man who was successful. We have spoken of Parsons' warm heart for his friends, and of the affection he inspired them with; we now can see how he was able to fill them also with implicit confidence. Working steadily, with a single object in view (for all his plans, political and ecclesiastical, can be reduced to one—the supremacy of his Society in England), he had proved, to his friends, his power of mind, his mastery of detail, his fertile resource, his devotion to his Society, and his influence with the great. It was no wonder he dazzled them, and that they, without questioning the means by which he achieved such great results, fell entirely under the spell of his potent personality. To them Robert Parsons was the one hope of regenerating England. His methods were the right ones. He was the New Apostle, and he was to do the work the old Apostles of England had done. But in a way vastly superior.

Father Henry Tichborne, Parsons' right hand in Rome, explains the situation in the following letter to Fr. Thomas Darbyshire, a Jesuit in Paris.[2] There was a talk of a measure

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 363, 364.

[2] The Jesuits, true to their Spanish policy, were bitter opponents of Henri IV., and they saw the *rapprochement* of Rome and France with alarm. "A Jesuit in Spain"

for gaining toleration for Catholics; Henri IV. had suggested a project of universal religious peace. This did not meet with Parsons' approval. The letter also affords us a glimpse of the repute Parsons had attained to, and his manner of conducting himself under the greatness he had achieved:—

"ROME, *2nd February* 1598.

"The reasons that moveth us in these parts to have hopes more than ordinary of the conversion of our country are very pregnant. First, the high degree of credit our principal pillars and agents have both in R(ome) and S(pain). The R(everend) F(ather) P(arsons) with the Pope himself (is) so accepted that he will not suffer him to use any other compliments of kneeling or other ways in his presence that is usual for cardinals. His nephew hath assigned to him his day of audience and sendeth his coach for him daily.

"He hath composed these desperate controversies between the fathers and scholars, and let out the corrupt blood with that dexterity as hath got him the fame of an expert physician; and hath triumphed so over the crew of malcontents that whereas before his coming to R(ome) the young youths were so averted from the S(panish) that they could not abide their sight and would not move their hats to the ambassador, he brought them to digest the one and respect the other. And to confirm me rather in this opinion, I find

(says Ranke, ii. p. 26) "preached publicly on the deplorable condition of the Church. 'It was not only the republic of Venice that favoured heretics; but—hush, hush,' he said, placing his fingers on his lips, 'but even the Pope himself.' These words resounded throughout Italy. On the 22nd of March 1590 the Spanish ambassador appeared in the papal apartments to make a formal protest in the name of his sovereign against the proceedings of the Pope. There was an opinion, as these things show us, more orthodox, more Catholic than that of the Pope himself. The Spanish ambassador now appeared in the palace to give this opinion effect and expression before the very face of the Pontiff. It was an extraordinary incident; the ambassador knelt on one knee and entreated His Holiness for permission to execute the commission of his lord. The Pope requested him to rise, saying it would be heresy to pursue the course he was contemplating against the Vicar of Christ. The ambassador would not suffer himself to be disconcerted. 'His Holiness,' he began, 'ought to proclaim without distinction the excommunication of all adherents of the King of Navarre. His Holiness should declare that Navarre was incapable of ascending the French throne under every circumstance and for all time. If this were not done, the Catholic King would abandon his allegiance to His Holiness, for the majesty of Spain could not permit the cause of Christ to be brought to ruin.'"

that, with great difficulty and the clamorous reluctations of our whole order, he hath avoided the red cap. Father C(resswell) in S(pain) and Fr. H(olt) in Flanders have, with the princes they deal with, no less credit than he here."

After speaking of the success of the seminaries, the writer goes on to say: "These evident testimonies of missions and commissions and pretensions of our Council at home (*are*) sent continuously to Fr. P(arsons) by express messengers, that all that seek to contradict or oppose him are either discarded or discredited, and all they can say or project to the contrary held for inventions and entertainment. . . .

"The only thing that is feared will be the interruption of this our settled hopes or (the) diminution of our credit is a report which hath been here very hot (?) of liberty of conscience at home, which is supposed to proceed from some deeper brain than our ordinary wits are wont to yield."

Fr. Tichborne then proceeds to give his correspondent the arguments for and against this liberty of conscience. These latter are of the greatest interests as being the key to most of the moves in the political game played by Parsons and his immediate disciples. We may also note that in the confidence of a private letter the writer betrays an acknowledgment that the Jesuit success in England, so boasted of and extolled at headquarters, was not really as solid as it was made to appear.

"It is objected on the one part and much feared (by) ours that this is the only means to discover the defeat and nakedness of our cause, and to show that that which we are fain to daub with such glorious colours is but a mere chimera and bare shadow; that there is no such number of men affected to our party as we would enforce, etc." And to the objections of those of the Society who were in favour of the proposed toleration: "Reply was made by ours that this means was so dangerous that what rigours of laws could not compass in so many years, this liberty and levity will effectuate in to-days, to wit: the disfurnishing of the seminaries, the disanimating of men to come and others to return, the expulsion of the Society, a confusion as in Germany, extinction of zeal and fervour, a disanimation of princes from the hot pursuit of the enterprise. Our rejection will leave us

hopeless and will fall out with us as with the sheep that made peace with the wolves on condition they should remove the dogs. So that, the circumstances and conditions necessarily implying the removal of the Company (which by their rule may admit no like conditions, and are our dogs), we shall be left as a prey to the wolves, that will besides drive our greatest patron to stoop to a peace which will be the utter ruin of an edifice, this many years in building. . . . This discourse of liberty is but an invention of idle heads, and neither for to be allowed or accepted if it might be procured, nor in itself possible to be procured for the former reason. . . . And here, by the way, I must advise you that Sir T. Tresh(am) as a friend of the state is holden among us for an atheist, and all other of his humour, either so or worse."[1]

The drift of this remarkable letter, which conveys the mind of Parsons (Tichborne was one of his secretaries), was to provide Darbyshire with a line of argument when dealing with those who were in favour of the proposed toleration. Elizabeth was old; and although she obstinately refused to appoint a successor, the mind of England was turning to James VI. of Scotland, who about this time was also approached by the majority of English Catholics with the promise of their support if he would promise them, at least, toleration. The King did undoubtedly give such a promise; and it is due to this that he was able so quietly to reach the throne. But this action of the Catholics of England was dead against all that Parsons had planned. They were daring to act by themselves. Such independence must be stopped at once, and they must be shown that liberty of conscience, and the peaceful right to practise their religion could only be bought at a price too great, namely, the expulsion of the Jesuits, the sheep-dogs. Parsons, it will be remembered, had been for years the opponent of James, and he was still hoping to counteract the movement against Spain.

It will not be without interest to examine here the organisation he instituted to secure intelligence from all parts. While admiring his manner of conducting business, the reader

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 262, No. 28. This instructive letter never reached its destination, but fell into the hands of the Government.

cannot help wondering where all the money came from to pay these express messengers who weekly traversed the Continent in long and expensive journeys to bear despatches to the Jesuit. Continual complaints are made in contemporary documents, that money contributed for the seminaries was diverted by Parsons to other uses; and that alms collected in England for the support of the Clergy and for poor prisoners were sent out of the country to keep Parsons and his agents. As regards the former accusation there is not, as will be seen, the least shadow of doubt as to its accuracy.[1]

From a long paper preserved in the Record Office[2] we get particulars of the arrangements Parsons made for keeping himself posted in news. Although from the internal evidence the paper was written a few years after the date we have now arrived at, we insert it here as illustrating the point we are discussing. So sure was he of ultimate success that certain localities had been already fixed up as colleges and residences for the Society in England. With that grim humour he often displays, Parsons fixed upon Burghley's own house in the Strand as the residence of the Jesuit Superior. Cambridge and Oxford, Norwich, Coventry, Chester, and Bristol, with a dozen other places, were already allotted as Jesuit settlements. But these were day-dreams for a future which never arrived. At the moment he stretched his arms over the Continent. The intelligencer says:

"Parsons maintaineth a man (whose name I cannot set down) sometimes and most commonly in Spain, sometimes in Italy, Flanders or France as he findeth occasion; he is

[1] "That the Jesuits under colour of godly uses do collect money of many Catholics that be the Queen's Majesty's subjects, and bestow it not on the poor of the English, according to the intention of the givers, but keep the same for their own private uses, for the printing of seditious books and aiding of such as will second them in their ambitions humours, who desire to bring the State of England to be only governed by them as well for spiritual and temporal affairs, to the overthrow of all the nobility and ancient laws and customs and privileges of England. That the General of the Jesuits hath given absolute authority to Father Parsons to send into England and to revoke such of his Society as he shall think good; and therefore it is likely he will maintain them in such courses and practices as he himself hath begun and set on foot for making of kings and changing of the State of England according to his fancy." S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 267, No. 67.

[2] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. (Addenda), vol. 34, No. 40.

gentlemanlike, with his man and couple of horses at all times only to execute the business and affairs of the said Parsons; speaks many languages, and findeth him for his turns. This I do not speak of my own mouth but after the report of others, as Mr. Griffin . . . and most men know it to be true that are either in favour with Parsons or other his interest and veriest friends; and so by that means told others, and so it at last comes out.

"Wherefore are English Jesuits placed in all places of great resort and in all great cities? And there must be but one, because they may give intelligences of all things and write to their superior, who is Parsons. As Talbot[1] at Loreto, because divers Englishmen came there before they came to Rome; and there he learneth all the news he can of them. Some by speaking them fair, others by his liberality . . . and then instructeth them to be for Fr. Parsons and detacheth them from the priests; for the fathers are religious, the others are not, and sets them against their lessons, and so urgeth. Whereupon he writes presently here to Rome, signalling that there come such an one to Rome either for their friends or else not worth anything; and so the poor man is known in Rome before he comes there. If he have any letters the said Talbot will send them, before if he be so foolish as to deliver them. Then besides, comes there continual the news of all places; yea (of) princes themselves. Then he certifieth the behaviour of the prince, then his carriage and conversation for the new copies must be had of all letters of state or of any substance, and so directed to Reverend Father Parsons the 'Lantern of our country,' as Dr. Worthington's certificate makes mention. . . .

"At Venice, young Father Adams, of young years, but well trained unto his habit and vow, will give notice of all things there. Wherefore is he placed there because the like place is not to be found in Italy for givings of intelligences for there is news of all places of the world, and who knows it before the Jesuits—few or none at all . . . (of the English resorting thither). And of their proceedings he doth doubt

[1] "The right hand of Parsons, to be employed in all matters as he thinketh good and findeth him capable." S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. (Addenda), vol. 34, No. 42.

lessly diligently hearken and send in of all in general and particulars to Father Parsons, whereby there is nothing unknown to him.

"Who giveth him news at Milan, I cannot tell, unless it be one Dr. Y. H. Fosnet that is there; for that he is rather an enemy to Englishmen than a friend, and will hardly speak with an Englishman. I know Mr. Griffin and he be now great friends. . . . At Bologna I know not who doth give him intelligence; but some one or other there is who gives him intelligence of all news that there befalls; and no Englishman passes that way without his privity. I can learn of no Englishman there, but only a friend who hath lived there very long and Doctor Thornton at the *Placentia*, Abbat. Allen (but his name is Heskett) at Perugia, who is all in all with Fr. Parsons.

"At Bruxelles, Baldwin,[1] who doth mainly work for Parsons and for the King of Spain, and is the superintendent (*superdamo*) of all Englishmen in Flanders, whom he pleases to set on his footcloth very bravely; and who is he that dares gainsay him in any of his proceedings, or dare contradict his letters or commands? Continual letters pass between him and Parsons, the one for the affairs of Rome, the other for Flanders; and their opinion in all matters and causes, and what they think most fit to be done there, both who are the greater traitors and villains to England.

"Coniers at Douai,[2] who was some time minister[3] of the English college, now governs the college at Douai, and is *penitenciarius* or *confessarius* of the college, although he be resident with the Jesuits at Douai. He is there placed

[1] In another paper of information we have the following: "Baldwin is a nimble-headed stifler to sift all men that either are there or come thither, whether they be for the King of Spain and the Jesuits or no, and appointing them what treatment he pleases. . . . Parsons hath set his brother George Parsons to rouse the English youth in that college (St. Omers), and to give him continual advertisement of their inclination and disposition." S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. (Addenda), vol. 34, No. 42.

[2] "At Douai, Coniers the Jesuit, because of his policy, was sent to Douai to secure his opinion of all comers, and so acquaint Parsons of all proceedings in the Flanders, and to see the college was governed in order. At Ghent, one Clarke, a canon, but altogether Jesuitised. At Bruxelles, a priest confessor to twenty-six English nuns, whereof the Lady Berkely is prioress; his name is Chambers" (*Ibid.*).

[3] *I.e.* procurator.

to none other purpose but only to look out the behaviour of the residents of our nation there; for that divers strangers come there out of England and go most to their confessions; and thereby (*Coniers*) knoweth how he may be employed. If he have money then he must go to the college and be admitted there; if poor and they can find sufficient excuses to shake him off, as divers be desirous to go for Rome, then writes he by the next post, which will be there before the Englishmen to cause them to give a lodging, and by that time that he comes there they know his errand, and is soon answered; thus is he there employed.

"At Dunkerque, Fr. Hungerford, to reconcile English persons that are there taken, and persuade them to serve the King of Spain, promising them large rewards and great preferments, and, as I do verily imagine, unto him be all the letters that are come from England first brought. The rest of the priests in Flanders harp all on the same string and emulate the Jesuits for all their factions and treasons as Worthington, Harris, Webbe, Darbyshire, Wright, and Storey. . . .

"There is one John Love in London, son unto Love the steward of Douai. He teacheth a French school about St Paul's in London—whether he giveth any intelligence into Flanders or not, I know not. Whereby he may be the better known, he is very lame and goeth halting and (*is*) a great height. . . .

"Dr. Davis at Paris,[1] it is said, hath his maintainance from the Jesuits of Flanders to advertise them of the proceed

[1] "Dr. Davis is an old man, grey-headed, a very great friend of the Jesuits. He hath correspondence with them by his daily letters. It is said that he hath maintenance of them, and certifies them of all news that happens in these parts; writes to Parsons and to the residents in Flanders, as I have been told by divers; and is had in great jealousie among the rest of the Englishmen in Paris" (S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. (Addenda), vol. 34, No. 41). "In France there are not so many for him (Parsons) as in the other countries, since the Jesuits were banished. Since when he hath been fain to sever himself of others; as at Calais he hath divers secret friends and whose names we cannot learn, for there they handle the matter so closely that they have one with a barque, a stipendiary, who in the night passeth out all the Jesuits, priests and traitors, and sets them on shore far from any town; and in the morning they repair to some Catholic houses in Kent, or else disguised like seamen or others travel up towards London in that manner, but if they be out of suspicion it must needs be that they have many friends at Calais that they can carry the matter so closely" (*Ibid*

ings of the English nation there, and which is against their plots, and also of the King of France his intentions towards war and such like. They busy their hands in all matters because they may not. . . .

"What laymen Parsons hath in England to gain him intelligence I know not, but am sure that nothing there publicly or private but that he hath present notice and intelligence. By whom but by the Jesuits that are his friends, who are very abundant and can convey on their letters at their pleasure; first either to Burdoux (Bruxelles?) to Baldwin, or else to Dr. Worthington at Douai, or Coniers the Jesuit, and so by the post to Rome which will arrive in twelve or fourteen days."

From this paper it will be seen that Parsons cannot plead the excuse that he did not know the state of affairs in England. It is only on the ground of a fixed confidence in himself that we can understand how, with such a master-mind, he could blind himself to the real meaning of events and not see how baseless were his dreams. Puritanism tends to blind one to everyday life; and it did so with Parsons. We can apply to him what Mr. Justin McCarthy, in his *History of the Four Georges*, says about Carteret:

"It was the intoxication of too confident and too self-conscious genius. Carteret was drunk with high spirits and with the conviction that he could manage foreign affairs as nobody else could manage them. No doubt, he knew far more about continental affairs than any of his English contemporaries; but he made the false mistake which other brilliant Foreign Secretaries have made in the foreign policy—he took too little account of the English people and of prosaic public opinion at home. In happy intoxication of this kind he reeled and revelled along his political career, like a man delighting in a wild ride after an exciting midnight orgy. He did not note the coming of the cold grey dawn and of the day when his going-on would become the wonder of respectable and commonplace observers."[1]

All roads lead to Rome, and along them hurry Parsons' messengers. It was generally on the Wednesday in each

[1] Vol. ii. pp. 321, 322.

week that they arrived at the English college, and brought despatches from England, France, Spain, Flanders, Naples and other places. As soon as he receives them, Parsons retires to the privacy of his own chamber and steadily sets to work to master their contents and meditate his replies. He has several private secretaries; for it would be impossible for one man to cope with such a correspondence. Fathers Walpole and Stephen Smith, together with a layman, John Wilson, are of the number. They are in readiness, and at noon on Thursdays receive the great man's orders. He dictates letter after letter, sometimes adding a few words in his own strongly marked handwriting as each is brought to him. The secretaries are kept hard at work, for Parsons is untiring, and time presses. On goes the writing continuously until midnight of the Saturday, when the correspondence is finished, and "John Wilson his man carries them to the post to be conveyed according to their several directions. But if they can meet any letters of any Englishman whatsoever, they will break them open, and it is no fault. But if any will presume to intercept any of the fathers' letters it is mortal sin for them; for they (the fathers) are worthies more than any other religious whatsoever."[1]

We have seen, according to a brother-Jesuit's letter, that Parsons rode in the Cardinal-nephew's carriage whenever he went to have audience. But he also had a coach and horses with two men at his sole command, which was placed at his disposal by Dr. Haddock. It is a matter of conjecture how the latter was able to supply the Jesuit with this luxury or necessary; for Haddock was known to be poor. According to the intelligencer, Haddock was only the apparent friend. The cost came out of funds of the English college, which "formerly was well able to maintain seventy scholars, (*but* now is not able to maintain fifty, although the living or revenue is rather increased than decreased; only excepted that Parsons, in despite and revenge of the scholars, sold away a great vineyard, the goodest in all Rome both for wines, walks, fruits, houses, water, and other necessaries whatsoever, and a thousand crowns under the value as would have been given

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. (Addenda), vol. 34, No. 40.

for the same."[1] To estimate the truth in the above assertion, it will be sufficient to know that Parsons was now the Prefect of the Mission, and in the written rules he is expressly authorised by the General of the Jesuits (who as a matter of fact had no power over the funds of the Clergy) to dispose of the funds of the seminaries according to his own judgment.

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. (Addenda), vol. 34, No. 42.

CHAPTER IX

SUBJUGATING THE CLERGY

WE must now go back to England and see how the Archpriest was received. The letter of Cardinal Cajetan reached George Blackwell on 9th May 1598. It came like a bolt from the blue, and caused the utmost consternation among the Clergy. It seems that they only knew of its contents by degrees; for on 27th May we find Mush writing to Mgr. Morro in Rome petitioning for the appointment of bishops, the removal of the Jesuits from the English college, the prohibition of all books (such as Parsons') treating of State affairs, and asking for liberty for the Clergy to establish regulations for their own government.[1] When the Clergy saw the document appointing Blackwell, the elder members pointed out that such an unheard of office was not instituted by the Pope, but on the responsibility of Cajetan, who was not their superior. They therefore refused to submit to the authority of the Archpriest; and based their refusal upon the illegality of the act in which they saw clearly the hand of Parsons. But they did not refuse to yield obedience to Blackwell,[2] pending an appeal to the Holy See which was now instituted.[3] Upon the first sign of opposition, the Jesuits in England, by Parsons' orders,[4] bestirred themselves to obtain letters of thanks for

[1] *Archpriest Controversy*, i. pp. 63, 64. [2] Colleton's *Just Defence*, p. 270.

[3] Colleton says in his *Just Defence*: "It was propounded unto us by Mr. Blackwell with apparent falsities and with orders directly tending to tyrannie, namely *that we should not discuss the Protector's authority, nor the institutions of our superiors, nor make any secret meetings for advising one the other*, when as the condition of our state embarreth us to meet publicly, *nor to write letters to any beyond the seas without his privity*" (see Preface).

[4] "This kind of epistoling is the direction of Father Parsons, as one told me and from the knowledge of his own eye, seeing the letter wherein he wrote the said direction" (John Maister to . . . (9th December 1598), *Archpriest Controversy*, p. 83).

the "most sweet form of government" instituted.[1] In spite of all their endeavours, out of four hundred priests, only fifty-seven—not including Blackwell and his assistants—could be found to sign the letters. So says Parsons;[2] and Garnett adds, that twenty-four others commissioned any others of the subscribing priests to insert their names.[3] The dissenters, who embraced not only the majority, but also the most reverend of the Clergy, are styled by Garnett "a few turbulent youths."[4]

The Appellant Controversy, which now began to rage, and for years tore in pieces the suffering and distracted English Catholics, caused Parsons much anxiety. Two of the priests, Robert Charnock and William Bishop, were selected to conduct the appeal on behalf of their brethren. It appears that letters were sent to England containing warnings that no appeal would be allowed; and that any messengers who came to Rome would be imprisoned. When the notice of appeal was given to Blackwell, Bishop tells us, "he pleaded mightily that no appellation could be made duly from the authority he is invested in, which he affirmed was absolute, not depending any whit at all upon the liking or gainsaying of priests here. Again, that he had received certain advertisement that whosoever should be employed or adventure to go and complain our griefs should be fined and imprisoned, order already given

[1] Parsons to Garnett (Naples, 12th and 13th July 1598): "I have seen what you write and also what many other grave priests do write (for it pleased the Protector's grace [to] impart with me these letters) about the good acceptance of the subordination appointed by His Holiness' order and Protector's letter among the Clergy there." He again speaks of His Holiness as having "declared that the Jesuits neither had nor ever desired authority or jurisdiction over priests in England"; and says the Pope was highly pleased with the letter of gratitude, and "also for they showed their great and holy union with those of the Society" (*Archpriest Controversy*, i. pp. 22, 23). Parsons, it will be remarked, was not at Rome when he wrote these letters. He was at Naples with Array for sake of the baths. In this same letter, which was evidently written to be shown, he mentions that Baronius "often told me that our youths dragged so much of martyrdom but they were *Refractarii* (that was his word), and had no part of martyrs' spirits which was in humility and obedience; His Holiness was grieved and vexed as it is a very lamentable thing to see him and hear him speak of the matter; and he told your said friend (*Parsons*) oftentimes that he never was so much vexed with any nation in the world, etc." (*Ibid.* p. 29).

[2] *Briefe Apologie*, p. 105.

[3] Plowden, *Remarks on Panzani*, p. 336.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 332.

to that end. He affirmed the Society had many things to charge me with, but refused to utter any in particular which must enforce me to write presently to Mr. Whalley (Garnett), letting him understand so much and entreat notice what they are."[1]

Robert Charnock writes to Bagshawe, Parsons' old Oxford opponent, and now one of the leaders of the Appeal (9th August 1598), "Perchance the prisons are not yet made ready for us which are threatened us if we go to appeal." And he goes on to say: "We suspect with the instruction which we have here, and what we shall have elsewhere, we shall go sufficiently armed to defend ourselves against such as shall oppose themselves; we make account that all the devils in hell will do the uttermost of their power against us; but we assure ourselves that there is a God, and as I hope some honest men, who hearing the reasonableness of our demands will listen somewhat unto us, and give us so much help as in their own consciences will stand with the honour of God and the good of our country, further than which we mean not to meddle, etc."[2]

Murmurs of schism were raised by the Archpriest's friends Garnett, who was an apt scholar of Parsons, describes (11th November 1598) the view he and his friends took of the situation. "And what have we done that all should not affect us Yea, by God's great goodness so it is (as we think) that if any affect us not, the fault is in them and not in us. So that if they would have themselves or others that do not affect us though otherwise seeming never so virtuous, to be chosen heads, let them first affect us (so far as in virtue they ought) that they may be worthy of government . . . So, on the other side, must I need acknowledge that it is, and by God's grace will I always procure that it shall always continue: that these two things are so annexed one to the other, that whosoever is opposite against our Rd. Archpresbyter must of force be consequently opposite against us. And therein will we *gloriari in Domino* if any be thought opposite to us who are opposite unto him."[3]

[1] *Archpriest Controversy*, i. pp. 67, 68.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 66.
[3] Garnett to W. Clarke, *Archpriest Controversy*, i. p. 81.

Meanwhile Charnock and Bishop, with such means as they could get together in the short time at their disposal, made their way, slowly and painfully, to Rome. Trusting too much in the justice of their cause, they felt, with the innate feeling which exists in English Catholics, that they had only to open their griefs, and at once find relief. It must be, however, remembered that if Rome possesses to a marked degree the imperial instinct of government, and has justice for her attribute, she moves very slowly. The government of the Church is vested in human hands which are moved by hearts opened to all manner of human motives; and therefore clever, unscrupulous men may, for a time, obtain an influence and a control which stand in the way of injured innocence. Providence, if we may be allowed to peer into Its designs, as manifested to us by the course of events, sometimes allows this, in order to ensure more completely the ultimate punishment of those who set up self-interest in place of Truth and Justice. Some such thoughts as these are necessary to bear in mind when we approach the sad and shameful story of the appeal to Rome.

The two priests arrived in Rome, 11th December 1598,[1] and, says Bishop (in a letter to Parsons written to refute the false reports the latter had circulated after the affair was concluded): . . . "not willing to acquaint that Court any further with the imperfections of our country than must needs, and desiring rather in fair and friendly sort to compose matters than to contend with our brethren, we went the same day into the college to open unto you our good meaning and purpose, requesting you to join with us about the contriving of some such loving, reasonable, and indifferent order as all honest parties might be contented, and so drawn unto one sweet and sure bond of peace and concord. The same our intention we declared shortly after unto both the Cardinals, Protectors.[2]

[1] In the Pilgrim Book of the English college (Foley, vi. p. 569) the two priests are entered as arriving 10th November and staying five days. This is clearly a mistake.

[2] ". . . So soon as they heard of his arrival in Rome and could come to him, which was upon the 21st of December, they brake the matter unto him, requesting him that he would listen to the just petitions of many well deserving of the Catholic Church, which, if he should do, they would not trouble His Holiness with the matter; and he willed them to bring in writing what they had to say, promising them that he would consider thereon" (*The Copies of Certain Discourses*, p. 81).

Cajetan, who was ere we came thither greatly incensed agains
us (God pardon his soul), and Burghesio, whom we foun
more calm and desirous that all our disputes might be wel
and quietly ended; you, Father, also seemed at the first no
unwilling to hearken unto that our proposition for peace
hoping then, belike, to win us to whatsoever order you shoul
devise and frame; but finding in few days' conference tha
we were resolute not to condescend to anything that wa
not equal and good generously for one as well as for another
you sent us word (much before our days of hospitality wer
accomplished)[1] to depart the college presently and to provid
for ourselves where we could; which we did, keeping fro
you the knowledge of our lodging; because then we began t
misdoubt some foul play, calling to mind how rudely you ha
handled the scholars and priests also before; and seeing tha
in the city we were then feared even of your friends as
shrewd, bustling bear. It fell out evil for us, that His Holi
ness as then was not there, who returned out of his journe
from Ferrara but three days before Christmas, so that for th
press of great personages who went to welcome him hom
and the festival days following, we could have no fit audienc
till after Christmas."[2]

Having been unsuccessful in winning over the envoy
Parsons saw them with alarm, free to go about the cit
and speak their minds upon the object of their appeal. Th
one thing necessary was to keep them from access to the Pop
who, if he had a hint of the real state of affairs in Englan
would be then bound to institute an independent inquir
Everything depended upon keeping things *in statu qu*
Elizabeth might die any day, and then would come th
moment to put a Catholic successor on the throne. For th
end Parsons felt it was not a time to hesitate about th
means he employed. Learning, through the indiscretion
one of the friends of the envoys, where they lodged, he pu
into force that plan of imprisonment already threatened an

[1] The deputies, on arrival in Rome, went to the English college, which w
bound, as representing the old English Hospice, to provide hospitality to Englishm
needing it. All had a right to three or eight days' entertainment.

[2] *The Copies of Certain Discourses*, p. 169.

who should come on appeal to Rome. Through his influence with Cajetan he obtained an order for their apprehension; and, in Bishop's narrative, "came upon St. Thomas (29th December), our patron's day (to make your celebration of those feasts), to visit us as a good friend and to advertise us that you had heard that it was His Holiness' pleasure that we should be restrained, but for the love you bare us, you were come before in haste (for you came puffing and blowing upstairs); what? to advise us belike to look to ourselves and to begone betime lest we should be taken; nothing so; but much more like to give us a Judas kiss, for you had the commissary with his ministers at your tail and came (for aught I can guess) to lead them to the place, and to appoint them out the persons whom they should take, and lead warily, not into prison, for there we were like to meet with ordinary officers, equal to all, but unto the college, that being shut up from all help we might be wholly at their devotions. I know, Father, that you came thither pretending to intreate for us that we were not sent unto prison: but that was but for a colour, for that you might have done as well absent as present, the commissary being wholly yours, set on, lead and lodged by you."[1]

It was a bold stroke. The envoys who were come to appeal against the doings of Parsons were arrested by him to prevent their access to the Pope; and, to make security surer, were imprisoned under the roof and in the custody of their enemy. Parsons as a gaoler does not appear in an amiable light.

Bishop reminds him how they were treated: "In the college we were locked up apart in two little close chambers, much more like the worst than the best in the house, with poor scholar's fare, and in smoky-coloured gowns such as the servants wear; far otherwise, Father, than you brag of: for the most part kept without fire, being very cold, and for twenty days not suffered to go out not so much as to hear Mass upon New Year's Day or the Epiphany."

Their luggage[2] was overhauled, and Parsons makes merry

[1] *Ibid.* p. 170.

[2] Charnock says: "All our writings were abstracted forcibly from us the first night of our incarceration" (*Archpriest Controversy*, i. p. 143).

over the contents. He holds up to ridicule, as being unworthy of priests,[1] the silken dresses and swords which they had brought as disguises on the journey. Strange, that in the exigencies of controversy he forgot the "suit of buff slashed with gold and the hat trimmed with feathers," in which he made his appearance in England in 1580.

Bishop says the envoys were put to an examination first of all by "one Signor Acarisius, a trusty friend of yours, Father Parsons, an humble servant of Cardinal Cajetan, our potent adversary. The examinations were: 'What is your name? how old? where remained you in England? how and which way came you over? what money brought you over with you?' etc., and much more like impertinent stuff to fill up the papers, that when we came to the matter itself they might be brief: taking barely what we came about, without the reasons and persuasions of it: yea, objecting against it and perverting it all they could.[2] And because Signor Acarisius seemed not somehow sharp enough, Father Parsons himself would be an examiner also. When I heard that Cardinal Cajetan should be our judge, I excepted against him as being our principal party; but I could not be heard. I called also for a proctor to assist us with his counsel. It was denied. No remedy, for there was nobody to be spoken to withal, but Fr. Parsons and whom he appointed. We had not so much liberty as one of us to confer with another. All our instructions were taken from us also, and neither pen nor any book allowed us wherewith we might help ourselves in that our common cause."

The result of such treatment was a foregone conclusion. Bishop saw this, and would not plead. A little before Shrovetide — that is to say on 17th February 1599 — the two cardinals, Cajetan and Borghese, came to the college and heard the examinations. Parsons assisted thereat, having Fr. Tichborne as his secretary. Charnock "used some words so much to the liking of the two cardinals, that had it not

[1] *A Briefe Apologie*, p. 193.

[2] Charnock states that he oftentimes during his examination protested against the answers which were set down as being his replies to the interrogations, and refused to speak any more if his answers were thus cooked" (*Archpriest Controversy*, i. p. 145).

been for company's sake he had been set at liberty the same day (as both Bishop and he were told by the Jesuits afterwards), for as they pretended the cardinals did not take well Fr. Bishop his answer, that he had nothing to say when he was licensed after his examination was read, and therefore commanded him to close prison, and Mr. Charnock also for company; and they thought that they did not Mr. Charnock any injury by making him a close prisoner again because Mr. Bishop his silence displeased them once and his earnestness at another time."[1]

On this occasion, instead of going into the reasons which occasioned the appeal to Rome, the ground was adroitly shifted by Parsons, and the envoys put on their trial. They were accused of ambition, and of a design to procure mitres for themselves. The Archpriest was represented by the secular priests Array and Haddock, who acted as proctors, and received their instructions from Parsons. They put in a memorandum of accusations against the envoys. Bishop "was very earnest to have the proctors put to their oaths that no falsehood was contained in the libel."[2] Cajetan, however, ruled that it was for the envoys to prove the accusation false. Bishop then demanded that a copy of the accusation or libel should be delivered to them, in order to meet fairly each point. "But when the proctors saw the resolution of the two priests, they humbly desired, with knee on the ground, that no such copy should be delivered, but that all things should be shut up in peace."[3] This was a common procedure used by Parsons and his friends. They did not scruple to make vague, general accusations, and then, when pressed on the point, shuffled and protested the interests of peace and charity as an excuse against investigation. The records of the Wisbeach scandals are full of such proceedings.

The result of the investigation was that the cardinals could not help seeing somewhat of the truths of the case. They called the envoys nearer to them, and "declared they had found no cause against them, only this: that they thought in their conscience that these two priests had inadvisedly taken this journey, because thereby they had scandalised many in

[1] *The Copies of Certain Discourses*, p. 95. [2] *Ibid.* p. 97. [3] *Ibid.*

England; to which the priests made answer that if they had given any scandal, they were sorry and ready to give satisfaction."[1] Without going into the cause of the appeal, the envoys were remanded to prison for two months more, to await the decision of the cardinals.

Bishop writing to his friends (20th February 1599) says in excuse for the Pope: "Whereupon His Holiness, who was so much troubled by the former tumults, that he may not abide to hear of any such others, condescended unto their petitions, that also informed him that if we were let alone he should never want some such as should always hereafter trouble and molest the court and city with English strife and contentions. . . . (*Concerning*) our last point of the college. It is by common report so quieted and all things ranged unto so good an order that Father Parsons thereby hath not a little increased his credit with His Holiness and in the whole court, so that there was no dealing in that matter."[2] Bishop had learnt to be wary; but a great deal can be read between the lines in this letter, which was written under Parsons' eyes. Charnock, too, had to write and, *teste* Fr. Owen, had to make certain additions to his letter at Parsons' orders.[3] This was given on 21st April. Bishop and Charnock were dismissed from confinement, and ordered to leave Rome within ten days. They were forbidden to return to England, Scotland, or Ireland. They were meanwhile put into the custody of Haddock and Array, who were charged to keep them out of mischief while they remained in Rome.

The interval had been well used by Parsons. As the appeal was against the Archpriest's appointment, he procured from the Pope on 6th April 1599 a Breve, which confirmed and pronounced valid the appointment of Blackwell as Archpriest. Having secured this, he was willing to let the envoys depart.

It will be interesting to compare this account of the treatment of Bishop and Charnock (taken from their own narratives, which was forced upon them by the false reports spread abroad), with Parsons' own account given in the book he wrote

[1] *Ibid.* p. 98.
[2] *Archpriest Controversy*, i. pp. 123, 124.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 79.

anonymously under the title "A Manifestation of the great folly and bad spirit of certayne in England calling themselves secular priests *who set forth dayly most infamous and contumacious libels against worthy men of their own religion, and divers of them their lawful superiors, of which libels sundry are here examined and refuted. By priests living in obedience* (1602)."[1] He says, quoting certain charges: "For how were they *excluded from doing their message* who were heard for three months' span together both by word and writing? How can they be said to have been *cast into prison, and cruelly* handled that were retired only unto two good chambers of the college, and as tenderly cared for and treated as the best in the house? With what probability can they say *that justice was violated, and all the laws both of God and man broken*, by this their restraint, seeing it was an ordinary thing daily, and upon less occasions than this, to far better and greater men than they? With what shame can they avouch that neither *His Holiness nor any competent judge under him heard their cause*, seeing two principal cardinals and His Holiness's fiscal both heard, examined, and determined the same after three months' hearing, conferring all with the Pope himself, as appeareth by the public records?"[2] The whole point of the matter, namely, that the envoys were not allowed to fulfil the purpose of their embassy, is evaded in this book, which Parsons pretends to be written "by priests living in obedience."[3]

[1] Fr. Rivers writing to Parsons (26th July 1602) says of this book that Bancroft says it "tasteth too much of Fr. Parsons' style, namely, *to quip and pay home, but all under colour of consideration of charity*" (Foley, i. p. 44).

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 53.

[3] In the *Briefe Apologie*, Parsons thus refers again to the matter: "But their ambassadors coming hither and showing no desire of peace and union at all, or to accept of any good condition to live in obedience under the Archpriest, but endeavouring rather by all means possible sinistrously to infame divers principal persons about the affairs of England, and thereby to set further discord so far forth as in them lay, His Holiness, for unavoidably greater sedition, commanded after more than a fortnight they had been at Rome, and neither by the earnest persuasion of the two cardinals, Cajetan and Burghesius and Fr. Parsons or others, could be persuaded to be quiet, and that divers letters out of England, Flanders, and other places came to His Holiness daily from the principal men of the English nation, requesting some restraint might be put to their seditious attempts; for these causes, I say His Holiness took order that they should be retired to the English college in Rome" (p. 8). It was a common practice of Parsons to ascribe to the personal initiative of the

The verdict of posterity is thus foretold by Dr. Ely in his *Certayne Briefe Notes*. He justly claims to be "an unpassionate secular priest, friend to both parties, but more friend to the truth." His words are of weight. "Cloak and disguise it so well as you can now, the posterity hereafter will wonder to hear or read that two Catholic priests, coming as appellants to Rome out of an heretical country, in which they maintained constantly with danger of their lives the honour and preservation of that see, and one of them [1] had suffered some years' imprisonment with banishment afterwards for the articles of St. Peter his successor's supremacy over all other princes and prelates, that these priests (I say) should, before they were heard what they had to say, be cast into prison, yea, and imprisoned in the house and under the custody of their adversaries, never was there heard of such injustice since good St. Peter sat in the Chair." [2]

When the news reached England, and the Pope's Breve confirming Blackwell arrived, the Clergy instantly submitted. Parsons (9th April) wrote what he terms "very courteous and pious letters" [3] to two of them. And Blackwell and Garnett also bear the same testimony. The latter says: "I hope all will be well, nay, all is well already. Mr. Colleton and Mr. Mush submitted themselves to the Archpriest the 19th of May, and promised to do what lay in them to bring in others." [4] The same testimony Parsons himself duly acknowledges in a letter, 17th July, to Mush. After this, the reader may be surprised to learn that Parsons asserts over and over again in the *Apologie* that the priests "never thought to submit themselves and obey."

The news of the imprisonment of the envoys had reached England, and gave the promise of victory to the Archpriest.

Pontiff what he had himself procured from the officiality. There is no evidence to show that the Pope in any point intervened or had taken personal cognisance of the merits of the case. Worthington among others of the party had written to Parsons about the envoys: "If these captains of new broils do find favour, they will stir up great storms in England, but if they be kept down with sharpness all will be quiet" (p. 10).

[1] *I.e.* Bishop.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 107.

[3] *A Briefe Apologie*, p. 8.

[4] Letters of 26th May and 3rd June. *A Briefe Apologie*, p. 145.

He now made his great mistake. Not content with the success, he tried to extort from the leaders of the appellants their signatures to a confession that they had been guilty of schism in thus appealing to the supreme authority. This extravagant demand broke at once the promise of peace. The Clergy most justly refused to incriminate themselves by a confession obviously false. The Archpriest persisted, and began to treat them as schismatics. His friends backed him up with all their power. One of the Jesuits in England, Father Lister,[1] wrote a treatise, which was authorised by Garnett and Blackwell, accusing of schism those who questioned the legality of the Archpriest's office. It was a bitter and reckless pamphlet, characterised by a lamentable ignorance of both fact and law, and rendering impossible any compromise between the contending parties. In view of this treatise it is impossible to look upon some of the Jesuits as peacemakers, but rather as pourers of oil upon a smouldering fire. "Their best friends," says Dr. Ely, "hang down their heads for shame" when Lister's book was mentioned.[2] Parsons sent word by Tichborne or Walford that the refusers of the appointed authority were schismatics, and that they should be refused absolution until they recanted.[3] Father Jones, another Jesuit, "raised another paradox more strange and absurd than that of Father Lister's," to the effect that those who maintained that the appellants were not schismatics, they themselves *ipso facto* incurred the censures of the Church.[4] Backed up by his friends,

[1] Of this Lister, who was now made use of to vilify the appellants, Garnett in 1597 wrote to the General: "I am distressed in soul, doubtful and undecided what to do with him, whose malady arises not so much from weakness of brain as from levity and unsettlement of mind" (*Tierney*, iii. p. cxxxiv., note). Two years after, the Jesuit superior could follow Lister's lead and bring himself to write (5th March 1599) in these terms to one of the most venerable of all the Clergy, John Colleton: "If those you have begot in Christ shall receive sacraments from your hands, they receive poison instead of medicine. They commit grievous sin if they ask you to celebrate or help you at Mass" (*Secret Policy of the English Jesuits*, p. 152).

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 275.

[3] *Tierney*, iii. p. cxxxvi.

[4] Colleton, *ibid.* p. 41. Fr. Richard Holtby also entered into the fray. He wrote, 30th June 1601, an open letter to a lady in which he asks: "Who are the Jesuits, or what have they done to give men any just occasion or ground to think of them so perversely?" He upholds the charge of schism "upon probable and sufficient grounds in my opinion, and in the opinion of others more learned than I" (*Archpriest Controversy*, i. pp. 184–9). This letter was the immediate cause of Colleton's *Just Defence*.

Blackwell sent a threatening and overbearing letter to Colleton (March 1599): "You have uttered too much bitterness against your betters, whom in regard of their calling you ought to reverence, of their learning to esteem, of their virtue to imitate, of their benefits to love, of their care for the profit of our country to favour, of their writings and admonitions not to revile, but to thank in a most humble and dutiful manner."[1]

A letter written by Garnett to Parsons, 21st July 1599, reveals, in the latter part, the animus and pretensions of superiority over the Clergy effected in reality, though openly disavowed. It will also be seen that the project of forbidding the envoys to return had already been discussed, and had met with the full approval of the writer:—

"MY VERY LOVING SIR,[2]—My last unto you was of the 7th July, and before that I got another the last of June, and before that I wrote 13th June, in answer of two of yours, that is of the 8th and 22nd May, which were the last I received.

"Our malcontents, although they have submitted themselves yet do divers of them prattle against us very bitterly. Some are offended that we take upon us to relieve and place pr(iest)s at their first coming; other, that we do not relieve all; other that it is against our profession of poverty to carry the common purse; all which offices we could willingly resign, but they that find fault are neither of credit nor willingness to relieve and place new comers; and if they carried the purse they might carry it up and down empty for anything I know or else hide it in some hole.

"They mightily inveigh against a book of Fr. Parsons read in the seminaries in Spain, which they call Mr. Parsons 'Commonwealth,' wherein they say it is enacted that pr(iest)s shall be put to their pensions when England shall be converted, a thing, as they say, intolerable. Also they bring forth two letters of Fr. Parsons, wherein they say he contradicteth himself concerning the course he took.

[1] *The Archpriest Controversy*, i. p. 85.

[2] Garnett to Maseo Tusinga at Venice, 21st July 1599. The dates in the first paragraph show the frequency of the correspondence, a point which has been contested by certain critics.

"I am not set resolute what course to take. Whether with patience to bear or to cause their punishment; yet in the meanwhile I have sent word to some of ours to admonish them in friendly sort, and we shall see after how to proceed.

"It is very expedient not to let the two ambassadors return, and to let them know that this is the cause, because their co-partners show stomach against us still; and it may be feared lest so will they. At the least, these fellows here will temper their feelings the more if they see their friends to be punished for their excesses."[1]

"These fellows," however, were driven to desperation. They determined upon a new appeal to Rome. But this time they were going to profit by the experience of the two envoys. These latter had been poor, and had no friends among the rich and influential in Rome. Besides, in their simple-mindedness, they had put their heads into the lion's jaw. This second appeal was to be conducted in a very different manner. To make sure of their theological standpoint, the appellants sent their case to the University of Paris, and received a decree, 3rd May 1600, which pronounced them free from all schismatical taint. This decision roused the Archpriest, Blackwell, to extreme measures. In a formal document of 29th May, he enjoined all ecclesiastical persons under pain of suspension, and all laymen under interdict, 'neither directly nor indirectly, (*to*) maintain or defend in word or in writing the censure of the University of Paris, whether it be truly given or forged, whether upon true information or otherwise";[2] and in a letter he communicated to Garnett the fact that "Colleton by my censure is defeated of all his triumphs."[3] But because Colleton and Mush continued to defend themselves from the charge of schism, the "Customer," as the Jesuits called Blackwell, by a formal decree of 17th October 1600, suspended them from all ecclesiastical office. This misguided attempt on the part of the Jesuits and Archpriest forced on the new appeal to Rome, and formal notice signed by thirty-three priests was delivered to Blackwell on 17th November 1600.

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 271, No. 105.
[2] *Tierney*, vol. iii. p. cxxxi.
[3] *Ibid.* p. cxxxii.

We now come to a curious episode in the story: the in tervention of the English Queen. Foley in his *Records of th English Province* follows the usual story, and says tha Elizabeth was the first mover in these dissensions, and tha they were stirred up on purpose to divide the Catholics. Thi certainly was not the case. The Queen had nothing to do wit the broils at Wisbeach, which were only the breaking out of long smouldering discontent. Neither had she had anythin to do with the appeal of Bishop and Charnock to Rome; an though, without doubt, well aware of what was going on, sh did not interfere until actually approached by one of th two contending parties. That she was ready to take an advantage of the disputes, if any fell in her way, is of cours probable. But with the full light that is nowadays poured upo the Past, it is difficult to see what advantage she could expec The Catholics were already divided, and her interference wa not necessary to secure that end. Moreover, the very fac of her interference gave a valuable weapon to the Jesuit who were not slow to urge against their opponents in Rom that they were consorting not only with heretics, but eve with an excommunicated Queen. There is no need to giv a sinister turn to everything the great English Queen di The simple truth is that she knew she could safely suppo the Clergy, who at least had no sympathy with Parson political design, however much they might have oppose her spiritual supremacy.

Bancroft, then Bishop of London, was commissioned t study the whole question; and with his licence the Clerg were able to publish their books in England. Through h means, most likely, Bluet,[1] one of the old priests, and the a prisoner at Framlingham, got leave of absence for ten day to visit some Catholics in London, and consult about th appeal. His arrival in town was reported, and Bancroft se for him. "I informed him that being the alms distributor the imprisoned, I had come for ten days with the keepe

[1] In his declaration to Cardinals Borghese and Aragoni we have a full account the events of this second appeal in the second volume of the *Archpriest Controve* (Petyt MSS.). This supplements what is already known from other contempor records.

ave for necessary matters. He went and told the Queen, nd ordered me to be kept in London in free custody from ie beginning of Lent to the end of July. The Archpriest ould not admit me to his presence, forbade me to celebrate lass, and all Catholics to aid me, so I received all this time ot a farthing, though I knew during the past three years 12,000 have been given by noble Catholics in aid of the nprisoned. This was done that I and my brethren might enounce our appeal, lest these affairs should come to His oliness' ears." At the end of June (1601) Bluet was troduced to some members of the Privy Council, and y their means obtained access to the Queen. A strange ght in truth. A priest, whose very existence in England as contrary to the law, kneels before Elizabeth, and nplores her aid in forwarding an appeal to the Apostolic ee against Parsons, the Jesuits in England, and their nctionary the Archpriest. The result was that four f the prisoners were discharged and allowed to go about ngland collecting alms for the expenses of the appeal; and s soon as they had made their preparations, they received assports and, for form's sake, were in the September banished ie country. They were Bluet, Bagshawe, Champney, and arnby.

The appellants had meanwhile sent their complaints to ome, and on 17th August 1601 the Pope sent to the rchpriest a Breve in which, while he reconfirms his appoint-ent, condemns Lister's book, and exhorts Blackwell to be ss irritating in his behaviour. The Breve reached London st as the four envoys were on the point of starting to Rome; ut the Archpriest kept it secret, and did not publish it for me five months. What was the reason of this extraordinary roceeding? In this Breve the Pope had ordered that no more ooks should be printed on the late controversy. This order as, of course, thoroughly well known to Parsons. But Black-ell was instructed to keep the Breve back until Parsons should ave time to print his *Briefe Apologie* for the Hierarchy insti-ted by the Pope, which he was then writing under the false uthorship on the title-page of "the priests united in due ubordination to the Archpriest." So we are distinctly told

by Colleton in his *Just Defence*,[1] and by Dr. Ely in his *Brie Notes*.[2] The *Apologie*, a violent and scurrilous attack on th Clergy, and calculated to destroy the credit of the envoys i particular, appeared at the New Year with Blackwell's per mission; and the Breve prohibiting any such publication was published on the 26th of January. This open piece c chicanery led Colleton to reply with his *Just Defence*, an Parsons, whose conscience could not stand such a violation c the Pope's published order, denounced the writer and th book to the Pope.[3]

The envoys passed over into France, where they obtaine letters of recommendation from the French King to hi ambassador in Rome. Leaving Bagshawe behind to watc over their interests at home and abroad, they were joined b Cecil, who travelled at his own expense. They arrived i Rome on 16th February 1602, and at once put themselve under the protection of Philippe de Bethune, the Frenc ambassador. He and Cardinal d'Ossat proved staunch allie and secured them the favour and protection of influentia personages. In the diary kept by Mush,[4] we have a fu account of all the difficulties the envoys had to combat, an a curious light is thrown upon Parsons' shifts and expedients.

The Jesuit had prepared himself for the combat, but wa reported to be "so troubled at their coming that he will spea to none of his friends."[5] All manner of injurious report both of their cause and persons, were spread about the city and everything was done to hinder their success. Of cours this time they kept clear of Parsons, and promptly refuse his offers of hospitality. Meeting him at the palace whi waiting for an audience, the Jesuit "marvelled greatly wh (they) were so strange as not to come to the college, nor t converse familiarly with him and others on his side."[6] Th French ambassador, who had ordered them to keep clear Parsons, promised to obtain them an audience of the Pop who was willing to receive them. As soon as this was know

[1] Preface, 1 and 2.
[2] Preface, p. 4.
[3] Stonyhurst MSS., Ang. A, iii. 21. See *Tierney*, vol. iii. p. clv.
[4] *The Archpriest Controversy*, ii. pp. 1–28.
[5] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. (Addenda), vol. 283, No. 53.
[6] *The Archpriest Controversy*, ii. p. 5.

Parsons got the Spanish ambassador to oppose this in the name of his master. For some little time the question was tossed about shuttlecock-wise, but at last it was decided in their favour. On 5th March, Clement VIII. received them graciously, and listened to all they had to say.[1] He then remitted the matter for due inquiry.

In the State Paper Office we find the following account of an audience granted to the envoys:—"All the four priests being before the Pope when they had their second audience, and Parsons being before to certify what he could against them; and to make their cause more odious signified how they came over by the Council's warrant, which no Catholic might do, and that they used them for instruments to serve their devices; whereupon the Pope took it very humorously against them, and said in these words: '*Multa mala audivi de vobis*'; whereupon they were all shamed, and Mr. Mush began to weep. He was not able to speak, but old Bluet took courage and said: '*Si rei fueramus alicujus culpae huc non veneramus; sed speramus quod veritas nostrae causae faciet nostram querelam esse allaccionem.*' Whereupon the Pope was well appeased, and that day had sentence that they were not schismatics and some other things.

"Had it not been for the Spanish ambassador, Parsons had been expulsed the college, and all his villainies made apparent unto the world. But the Pope and the King of Spain are too far in amity and league, that the Pope will not do anything which the King should in anywise dislike more than to offend him. But upon the last and final one of all matters then in question, the priests' chiefest demand was to remove the Archpriest, which the Pope would not do, in respect he had appointed him in that place, and therefore not to stand with His Holiness' credit to remove him that was authorised by virtue of his Breve. The priests with that not contented, frowned and thought themselves greatly wronged, for it was their chiefest article which they required, and the residue might the rather have been borne withal. Then the Pope said: 'What will you have me do? Shall I lose the King of

[1] They had gone on the day appointed, but, owing to business, audience had been postponed.

he has been prevented from murdering a fellow-prisoner only by the interference of his companions, and in another has attempted, but in vain, to administer the sacraments while reeling and staggering from the effects from a drunken debauch. Champney and Mush, though treated with less violence than their companions, do not entirely escape. Both, says the writer, have been candidates for admission into the Society, and both have been rejected on account of their impracticable tempers. Hence the enmity of each to the fathers, and hence Mush, in particular, yielding to the suggestions of an impetuous and resentful disposition, has been led to join with the heretics against his brethren, and to assist in writing their books, which have at once defamed the Society, and scandalised every orthodox society. Such is a brief outline of the principal parts of this extraordinary document."[1]

For nearly eight months they had to bear this persecution; but justice was slowly making its way. As early as 4th April 1602 it was formally decided that the preposterous charge of schism, made against men, on the very ground of their appealing to the Holy See, could not be maintained. The French ambassador proved a true friend, and was successfully counteracting the intrigues of the Spanish ambassador who was always at Parsons' elbow. In June, Elizabeth wrote to Philippe de Bethune to thank him for his efforts.

Parsons could not help seeing that the persistent way in which the envoys kept away from all intercourse with him was doing considerable harm to his credit. Some of the cardinals had tried to induce them to make friends with the Jesuit; one, who did not at that time even know that Parsons was alive, when he learnt the news, wanted to give a grand dinner of reconciliation.[2] But they would not move from their position. Taking advantage of the coming festival of Pentecost, Parsons addressed the following letter to "my old friend, Mr. Mush":—

"For this is the vigil of the Holy Ghost which came as to-morrow upon the first professors of our Christian religion, giving them that true divine spirit whereby only men may be saved; and for that no spirit is so opposite and repugnant to

[1] *Tierney*, vol. iii. p. clvii., note. [2] Mush's *Diary*, p. 17.

this, by the testimony of Christ and His apostles themselves, as the spirit of disunion, contention, envy and emulation, anger and enmity, as St. Paul, you know, in particular setteth down to the Galatians (at the very cogitation whereof I confess unto you truly and sincerely in the sight of Almighty God that my heart trembleth whensoever I consider the danger); and forasmuch as you and your company having been now full three months, I think, in this city, have fled, as it were, our company and conversation that are of the same religion and communion with you, and have been your old friends and brethren in times past, and have invited you divers ways since your coming to the city to more friendly and charitable meeting and dealing together than you hitherto have showed yourself willing to embrace; for all these, and some other considerations which here in particular you will perceive, I have thought good at this time (though in most men's opinions *I be the man of all other most injured by you and your brethren in their books and speeches*) to break this long silence, by occasion of this high and holy feast putting us in mind what spirit we must put on and follow if we mean to arrive at eternal salvation, and what spirit we must fly to avoid perdition, according to the plain denunciation of the Apostle: *Si quis spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est ejus.* And whether this be the spirit of Christ to contend in this sort, to emulate, to envy, to fly company of another, and to raise more scandals in our new planted English Catholic Church, that lieth so grievously under the hand of the persecutor, yea, and to join with the persecutor himself to help out our passionate pretences against our own brethren,—this, I say, is easy to consider all them that are out of passion for the present, and will be at the Day of Judgment to all the world, but especially to the doers themselves. Alas! Mr. Mush, is it possible that priests, illuminated once with God's grace and brought up for many years in the exercise of meditation of spirit and spiritual courses, should come now by passion into such darkness as not to see or discern these so damnable things, which every common and ordinary and Catholic man, understanding the cause, doth condemn and cry shame to our whole nation for the same?

"Your best friends, both here and elsewhere, as far as I

could ever understand, do not otherwise go about to defend or excuse you or your fact, but by saying that all men have their passion when they are exasperated, and consequently that you ought not to have been so much irked in England as you were; which grant it were so, and that you were provoked indeed somewhat more by sharp words and facts, upon occasions given by you, than other men would have wished (in which point, notwithstanding, other men defend themselves,[1] and you cannot in conscience deny to have known and seen *my desire to the contrary, by my often letters both to you and others for sweetness and moderation*)—but grant, I say, that the excuse of your friends were true, and that you had some occasion to enter into passion and breach as you did, it doth not deliver you from the guilt of such scandals and damages as, by your perseverance in that passion, have ensued since, and daily do increase both at home and abroad. Neither doth it take away your obligation to lay down that passion, especially now, after so long time, and to come to some moderate and reasonable atonement with your brethren, by staying matters at home and by discussing your controversies friendly and charitably here, as Christ commandeth all men so to do, but especially such as offer at His holy altar daily; and you cannot but remember the dreadful threat of His Apostle against them that receive there His Body unworthily; which you know to be in the highest degree in him that is in hatred, enmity, contention, or emulation with his brethren.

"Wherefore I do most heartily beseech you, Mr. Mush and the rest of your fellow-priests there with you, even for the love of our Saviour Jesus Christ, giver of all good spirits, and for reverence of the Holy Ghost, whose happy and blessed coming is celebrated to-morrow, that you consider well with yourselves what spirit leadeth you and yours in this contention

[1] Writing privately to Garnett a few months later, and touching on this point, Parsons could candidly say: "So many sharp letters have been showed here, as made our best friends say there was too much fervour, which encountering with no less heat on the other, and brought out this flame, and all alighted upon 446 (*Parsons*). Well now, I trust the matter is well past; and he prayeth you to let him repose awhile for at least a year or two, for so he hath need" (Stonyhurst MSS., Ang. A, iii. 24). It is worth while comparing this avowal with the domineering tone of the letter which tries to conceal or deny the errors of his party.

whither it tendeth, what lamentable effects it hath wrought already and doth work daily in England, by the breach there made among Catholic people, what scandals have fallen out and do fall out continually *beyond your expectation or wills I am sure*; this being the nature and condition of divisions and contentions once begun, to break out further and to fouler effects than the authors at the beginning did imagine; whereof, notwithstanding, they remain culpable both before God and man, if they seek not to stay them in time; and you must remember that it will be but a small excuse to posterity for so great mischiefs to say that you were put in anger or rage by others; and much less defence and excuse can it be with God at His tribunal, whose just dread ought to possess us all. Neither must you think or say, as men are wont to do that love not peace, that this is written for any other end; but only to put you in mind of this present holy feast and of all our duties therein, to look to the spirit whereby we are guided and to take the course which Christian Catholic priests ought to do. For, as for other matters, touching the controversy in hand about your Superior in England, you may easily guess, by that you have seen already, how it is likely to go in the end, and how little cause we have, that stand with the Archpriest, to seek other atonement than by judgment and sentence of His Holiness and judges appointed; neither do we desire or can accept other; but yet, for that Christian charitable behaviour, in the mean space, doth nothing prejudicate this final and judicial determination in my opinion, I was induced to write you this, for the present. God's Holy Spirit inspire you to take and use it to His glory and your own good: to whose holy benediction I commend you and yours and myself to all your prayers.

"From the English College, this Whitsuneve, 25th May 1602."[1]

Putting this letter, written at a moment when the Puritan element in Parsons' character was largely to the front, besides certain well-ascertained facts which were occurring at the same time, we are obliged to view the edifying terms as not entirely free from ulterior motives. And this in spite of Parsons'

[1] *Tierney*, vol. iii. pp. clxii–clxv.

nervous disclaimer. So certain was he of the impossibility of his position being wrong, that he evidently thought that his practices against the appellants and those they represented had escaped observation; and so convinced was he of his own cleverness and ability, that he was led to treat his opponents as mere children, or men who could not see what was clear to all the world. If we allow, under the spiritual influence of the feast, his sentiments, though perverted, were genuine, what are we to think of the man who within a few days could draw up the accusations against the characters of his opponents, and fifteen days later was declaring that the very men he addresses in his letter "had instigated the late executions in England, and in terms that can scarcely be misunderstood, entreating the Pope's permission to deal with them in such manner as to make them feel the enormity of their crime, and be thankful for any future indulgence"?[1]

What also is to be said of the man who could write thus to Mr. Mush and, at the same time, in that extraordinarily bitter book, *The Manifestation of the Folly*, sneer at him as having been "a poor rude serving man," received and educated by the Jesuits out of charity, and known afterwards as "Doctor Dodipol Mush"? Truly, as the learned Canon Tierney remarks, that Parsons "should have been able to pen such a letter as the present carries with it something so painful and at the same time so humbling to our nature, that the mind gladly and almost instinctively turns from its contemplation."[2]

We may perhaps find the key to this letter (which was of course rejected) in this. Parsons, while he knew he had succeeded in keeping the Archpriest in office, was also aware that there was still being discussed the question of reprimanding him and forbidding him to communicate with the Superior of the Jesuits. There is but little doubt that Parsons foresaw that the appellants were likely to be successful on these points. It was therefore important to conciliate their minds and, if possible, to prevent them from proceeding.

But in a letter written by his order the following day for two Jesuits, Jackson and Hunt, on their departure for the

[1] Tierney, quoting from Stonyhurst MSS., Ang. A iii. 17.
[2] Vol. iii. p. clxiii., note.

English Mission, he warns them to be careful in their dealings with the Clergy. He says: "When you shall be arrived in England it behoveth our fathers very much, as also the Archpriest, that they be very circumspect and careful of offence or aversion to any, but by charity and patient labour to get and keep the good affection of all. . . . And this is not only his opinion but the will of His Holiness and of Father General who . . . observes also and much mislikes the manner of proceeding used by the Archpriest and his friends, and wishes he had shown more mildness and rather a sense of feeling of compassion than of so much choler and indignation; for although they were well persuaded of his good mind, and attribute all to his great zeal,[1] yet they hold it had been much better to have dissembled many things and referred them hither to be censured here . . . . and to come to our fathers; some writings and sayings also of theirs in this affair have been misliked by His Holiness and Father General; and especially the 'Treatise of Schism' in regard of the vehement exaggerations uttered in more sharp terms than they think was beseeming for a religious person to set down . . . His hope is therefore that hereafter they will be more wary, and seek to remedy errors past by the most convenient means they can . . . yet they cannot but think (the circumstances of both time and place considered) both the Archpriest and our fathers might and should have proceeded otherwise, and therefore cannot be wholly excused, etc."[2]

It is not our purpose to follow Parsons at length in all the details of his proceedings in the matter. We have brought forward enough for our purpose to show the way in which he carried on the struggle. Granting the standpoint he took throughout, his course was natural and consistent with himself; but judging by the ordinary laws of truth and honesty, putting aside those of wisdom and Christian charity, we are unable to allow his standpoint, and therefore must declare him to be blameworthy.

A letter from the spy Tracy, at Venice, to Cecil (3rd May 1602) gives the impression obtaining at that time. "In

[1] As a matter of fact, the Pope attributed the Archpriest's behaviour partly to his ignorance and partly to the mischievous advice of others. See Breve of 5th October 1602.

[2] *Tierney*, vol. ii. pp. clxviii–clxxi.

the contest between the secular priests and Jesuits, the priests, having overpassed the greatest difficulty, will prevail—Parsons, after the day of hearing was appointed, got a delay of fifteen days, and then five more; and then sent to the Pope his twenty days' work, which was six sheets filled with such matter [1] as to incense the Pope and make Cardinal Borghese, one of the commissioners and his chiefest friend, say, he had a diabolic spirit. When these things are ended other things hard to answer will be brought against him." [2] The cause of Parsons' absence from Rome at this juncture seems to have been two visits to Civita Vecchia, to meet the Duke of Feria, and the vice-Queen of Naples, a former penitent of his, and who was now returning to Spain after the death of her husband.[3]

At last about October the business was finished, although from a letter of Paget to Cecil (15th September 1602) the decision of the Commissioners was known to Parsons, who had already written the news to Owen and others.[4] A last attempt on Parsons' part to get the Pope to insist upon a public reconciliation failed. Had he succeeded, it would have seriously damaged the credit of the envoys at home.

They had gained something; although on other points they had been foiled. A Breve dated 5th October 1602, condemned the conduct of Blackwell, and forbade him, for the sake of peace, to consult the Superior of the Jesuits, or even the General, on the concerns of his office; the appellants were declared free from all taint of schism; and the Archpriest was advised to fill the first three vacancies in the number of his assistants with persons chosen from the appellants.

Parsons had seen that, in spite of all his endeavours, the prohibitory claim was to be inserted in the Breve. He tried to have it stated in the document that the Jesuits had petitioned to be relieved of the duty of advising the Archpriest.[5] But failing in this, he could only look to the near future, when the prohibition might either be removed or

[1] This was probably the memorial against the morals of the envoys.

[2] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 284, No. 2. [3] *Ibid.* No. 25.

[4] *Ibid.* vol. 285, No. 6.

[5] The deputies went on 9th August to Borghese, who told them that "Father Parsons was also displeased with the order more than we." Fitzherbert "laboured that Parsons might be agent to Rome for our Church and Fr. Whalley (Garnett)

become a dead letter. He wrote to Garnett in the August: "As for the clause 450, 39, etc. etc., it must stand for the present; otherwise there could be no peace; after, when inconveniences are proved, they may be represented by means of 266, who with help of 255 may procure sufficient remedy."[1]

And how was the affair meanwhile received in England? The Government was kept informed by two sources of the progress of the appeal. Bagshawe in Paris was the main informant of Bancroft; but Cecil, through Phelippes, had his reports from the Jesuit side. There are a whole series of these from Rome in the State Paper Office; and while giving full accounts very favourable to the side of the Archpriest and Jesuits, the writer is anonymous. But time reveals all things. Parsons, who was charging against the envoys their dealings with the heretical government, was the real author of these reports to Cecil. A rough copy of the report of 25th May 1602[2] in the handwriting of Robert Parsons is preserved, so says Foley,[3] in the Stonyhurst Archives.

In the correspondence between Fr. Rivers, the Socius to Garnett, and Parsons, given by Foley,[4] we can catch a glimpse of the feeling among the party in England as the cause went on.

"Their associates here make report of their very honourable entertainment by the French ambassador and others, and how Mark [Parsons] would not be seen for many days after, pretending that he was busied in some serious exercise; with that and like untruths they seek to put heart into their confederates, as though all were like to pass current for them" (30th March 1602).[5]

Again: "I was right glad as well to understand of your good health; as also to hear how the appellants proceeded in their business, of which subject you gave full relation; for

moderator in all controversies in England, that the Archpriest might ask his counsel in government" (*The Archpriest Controversy*, ii. pp. 19–22).

[1] *The Archpriest Controversy*, ii. p. 25. Mush adds: "We hear that Parsons and his bragged that the Pope had kept us so many months, and now in the end had granted us nothing to the purpose. That, poor men, we durst not return into England, for we should be little welcomed to the Q. and Council, seeing we could not procure them peace, as they expected we should. And we failing, she should be fain to seek it at their hands that could bring it to pass, meaning his and his Jesuits" (*Ibid.* p. 26).

[2] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 284, No. 25.

[3] *Records*, i. p. xiii.

[4] *Ibid.* vol. i.

[5] P. 5.

which I heartily thank you, and it will be for good purpose for the satisfying of others who were before made believe by their associates that they had found very favourable audience, with many assurances of very good success in their designs; all of which we now perceive how assonant they are to former courses, hitherunto prosecuted by ignominious slanderers and most untrue reports" (7th April 1602).[1]

"The appellants' associates here exult exceedingly, and give out confidently that the [? Pope] hath defined them to have incurred no schism nor committed any sin, and that he hath [? rejected] all the accusations tendered by Fr. Parsons and the procurators against them as frivolous and untrue, and will have no more speech thereof" (20th May 1602).[2]

"I had now from your factor Nicholas [Smith] a letter . . . wherein he insinuateth that Clement is indulgent. I pray God it be not *ne quid nimis*. The associates to the appellants exult *ultra modum*, and friends are much dejected to hear as yet of no better success; but *sic ut quimus quando ut volumus non licet*. I have seen their proposition for bishops, archpriests, assistants, syndics, *et quid non? Spectatum admissi risum teneatis amici!* We hope the event will be more consonant to their deserts" (2nd June 1602).[3]

And lastly: "The friends, on the contrary, are much dejected, and will be more so if the tide turn not the sooner" (30th June 1602).[4]

Garnett, the Superior in England, did not like the result of the appeal. He had very extensive faculties, which were a source of considerable influence, as before Blackwell's appointment he had been able to subdelegate them to such of the Clergy as he chose. But he was not allowed now to do this, as all faculties for the Clergy were to be given only by the Archpriest. In a letter to Parsons (June 1598) Garnett had already lamented this; "for," says he, "by this also have I lost the chiefest means I had to win the favour of good honest priests."

Among the Clergy there was very little satisfaction. They felt themselves, so far, beaten. But English perseverance was to gain the day in the end. The contest was to last many years, and generation after generation was to carry it on. The

[1] P. 26. [2] P. 36. [3] Pp. 36, 37. [4] P. 4.

general opinion at this moment is caught by Bancroft, who writes to Cecil (28th December 1602): "The success of affairs from Rome is not acceptable to the appellants, so that there is likely to be another appeal from a Pope who is chaplain to the King of Spain to a Pope the true vicar of Christ."[1]

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Eliz. vol. 286, No. 17.

CHAPTER X

THE GUNPOWDER PLOT

WE have now to consider some of the events concerned with the accession to the English Crown of James VI. of Scotland, and with the action of English Jesuits therein. I shall endeavour in this chapter, as far as possible, to disentangle the story from the extraordinary state of confusion which makes the documentary evidence of this period so perplexing. I have had to find my way through a labyrinth of downright falsehoods and deliberate contradictions on all sides. But I think I am able, at last, to treat the subject on lines which do not admit of any attempt at confusing a plain issue.

As far back as 24th September 1599, James had written to the Pope (Clement VIII.) to defend himself against the attacks and calumnies of "ill-willers who, by commemorating our injuries done to Catholics, procure envy to us and favour to themselves"; and, in order to have a defender in the *Curiâ*, he asked that the Scottish Bishop of Vazion should be made Cardinal. The letter is signed "Your Holiness's most dutiful son, J. R."

The practical reply of the Pope, who was then under Spanish influence, was to send two Breves to the English Catholics and to the Clergy. They are dated 5th July 1600. The laity are ordered to join no party, nor to give their support to any claimant who is manifestly alien from the Catholic faith, or has fallen under suspicion of heresy. "For," says the Pope, "there can be no fellowship between light and darkness, nor peace between Catholics and heretics; whilst these adhere to their impiety and errors, they can have no part with you. . . . We, in fitting time and place, will aid you with God in every way as far as we can."[2]

[1] Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, i. p. 162. [2] *Tierney*, iv. pp. cvi-cvii.

P. HENRICVS GARNETVS

HENRY GARNETT, S.J.

1555—1606

EXECUTED IN ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD, MAY 3RD

From an old Flemish engraving

These Breves were transmitted by Parsons[1] to Henry Garnett, the Jesuit Superior in England, who kept them in his possession until such time as they could be published with effect. But he did not keep them private. They were shown to Catesby and Winter, both belonging to his party, and afterwards ringleaders in the Powder Plot.

A week after the issue of these Breves, another dated 12th July was sent to the Nuncio in Flanders, to whom the Pope says: "Your fraternity can see the state in which English affairs are, and that it is very likely there will soon be a great change by the death of her who, by the secret judgment of God, has so long afflicted that noble kingdom." The Nuncio is then informed that the Pope is preparing means thereunto: the English Catholics have been ordered to unite and refuse their support to anyone who is not of their faith; so, as soon as the Nuncio hears that "the miserable woman" is dead, he has to write to the laity, ordering them, in the Pope's name, to stand steady and to work for a Catholic King who will "give to Us and to Our Successors true obedience."[2]

The reader will see at once that these Breves are directed against James, and suggest a Spanish succession. And if he suspects that Parsons in this, the supreme hour of his policy, had a hand therein, he will not be wrong. For besides transmitting these Breves to Garnett, Parsons also sent instructions to the Nuncio (20th July 1600) to the effect that the gist of the Breves should be at once sent to the Clergy, and to the Superior of the Jesuits,[3] who in turn would keep him informed of the progress of events. Taking advantage of this communication, Parsons was not going to lose so favourable an opportunity of securing the Nuncio's aid in subjugating the Clergy to his Society. He therefore impresses on him the

[1] Parsons had written in 1600 to the Pope that there was a good hope of toleration in England if His Holiness would instruct his Nuncios in France and Flanders earnestly to solicit it, for the French King is said to have made overtures in this direction. The Queen is reported to be not disinclined to grant it, and some of her Council to favour it. Stonyhurst MS. quoted in *The Month*. The date of this document is not given, but I expect it will be found to have a connection with the appellants then in Rome.

[2] *Ibid.* iii. p. lxx.

[3] But the Breves themselves had already been sent privately to Garnett.

necessity of seeing that union and concord, "the one thing necessary for this time and matter," should be preserved among priests "who are leaders of others." The authority of the Archpriest must be upheld for this end; and any who venture upon disturbing this union must be punished.[1]

And at the same time Parsons was keeping his hand on the King of Spain, hoping still to induce him to strike when the moment came. The following Report of the Council of State to Philip III. (11th July 1600) is based on letters received from Rome containing information and advice from Parsons:—

"The Queen of England will not live long, and the English Catholics beg your Majesty to declare yourself in the matter of the succession. . . . Your Majesty's decision may be conveyed in confidence to the Archpriest and General of the Jesuits in England, so that it may be published at the proper time. . . .

"It is agreed that the first thing is to exclude utterly from the succession the Kings of Scotland and France. It is needless to trouble your Majesty with the reasons for this, as they are obvious. . . .

"The answer to be given to Father Parsons may also be left to the Duke [*of Sessa, Ambassador in Rome*]. We here are of opinion that Parsons may be told, as was before resolved, that your Majesty would nominate a Catholic sovereign, and had decided on the person, and the Duke might add, as if on his own motion, that he suspected it would be the Infanta. . . . As in a matter of this sort, right is the least important element in the claim, although it is necessary, in order to justify the employment of force, the Council is of opinion that financial points should at once be considered, and that a decision should be promptly adopted, whilst the forces of Flanders and the Fleet should be made ready, so that on the very day the Queen dies a movement be made from both sides simultaneously, in favour of the object aimed at."[2]

On 2nd September the Council informed Creswell that the King replied to the report that the affair of the succession was so grave as to need very patient consideration. The

[1] *Ibid.* p. lxxi.

[1] Cal. S. S. P. (Simancas), vol. iv. p. 665.

truth was, Spain was quite unable at that time to exert herself in any cause.

While leaving no means untried to secure the success of the great plan for which he had worked so long, Parsons, however bold a front he may have shown to his friends, was not without a certain sense of approaching failure. He began a double game, and sought to ingratiate himself with James. Six months before he sent to the Nuncio the above instructions, he had already written (24th January 1600) a long letter to the Earl of Angus, which was calculated to create a good impression upon James. It was full of assurances of friendship towards the King.[1] The dangerous experiment of hunting with the hounds and running with the hare failed. It would not be beyond probability were we to suppose that the coming King saw through Parsons' device, and that his rejection of the offer led to the pro-Spanish Breves which came out in the following July.

As Rome then always responded to the Jesuit wishes, and used her authority at their call, is it to be supposed that the Jesuits in England would altogether refrain from attempting to prevent James from succeeding, and that the great opportunity would be allowed to slip away without an effort being made? It would not be reasonable to suppose this. As a mere matter of fact, English Jesuits did not refrain, but took part in some of the plots which now began to thicken.

Shortly after Christmas 1601 Catesby, Tresham, and Thomas Winter, all future conspirators in the Powder Plot, met Garnett (and Greenway most probably) at a house called "White Webbs" on the borders of Enfield Chase.[2] This house, kept by Anne Vaux,[3] was used by Garnett as a residence and a place of meeting for his subjects. The three laymen proposed to the Jesuit Superior that efforts should be

[1] See the letter in Plowden's *Remarks on Panzani*, p. 353.

[2] S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. xix. No. 35. The old house known as *White Webbs* no longer exists. Some foundations still to be seen near the old public-house, *The King and Tinker*, are probably those of the outhouses belonging to the house. The present building, known as White Webbs, dates from last century, and is built on an adjacent site. The royal park and residence of Theobald's is close by; and within a few miles are the Government gunpowder works at Waltham.

[3] *Ibid.*

made to induce the King of Spain to attempt another invasion of England.[1] Garnett confesses at his trial that he "misliked it."[2] Nevertheless, after several other meetings, it was agreed that Winter and Fr. Greenway should go to Spain about the business, and that Garnett "to give more credit" should write to Fr. Creswell, who was influential at the Spanish Court. Garnett did write; but he says the only object of his letter was to get the King to send money for the poor Catholics. This is at best but an ambiguous expression; for we must bear in mind that it was Garnett's fixed policy only to admit what he knew the Government had already evidence of; and we must also remember Parsons' assertion that Garnett was mixed up in the political intrigues of the day. In the face of the fact that the envoys, one of them, too, a Jesuit and subject to Garnett, did come to an arrangement with Philip, it is difficult to see how the letter of credit could have been in reality so inoffensive as Garnett pleads. In effect, by helping these laymen, Garnett was only acting in the spirit of the two Breves he had at that moment in his possession. Philip agreed to pay 100,000 crowns to secure a party among the English; and an army was promised to be landed either on the coasts of Kent or Essex, or at Milford Haven. Having thus satisfactorily completed their business, Winter returned to Garnett to tell him of all that was done. The Jesuit Superior, however, says that he "misliked" it, and that Rome would not approve. Be this as it may, there is no evidence that he did anything to prevent the plot; on the contrary, he confesses he unlawfully concealed it. It may be

[1] Tresham, after much prevarication, confessed (13th November) "that Greenway and Garnett, as well as Lord Monteagle and Catesby, were acquainted with the fact and the purpose of that mission" (S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. xvi. No. 63). But a few days before his death he dictated a declaration, to the effect that he had made this avowal only "to avoid ill-usage," and went on to say "upon his salvation" that he knew nothing of Garnett's privity to the mission of Winter to Spain; and adds that he had not "seen Garnett for sixteen years before, nor never had letter nor message from him." This is an absolutely false statement. Garnett (and other witnesses) allows that Tresham had been with him continually until within a few days of the Plot. Can it be wondered that Coke should write (24th March 1606) to Salisbury upon this declaration, and say: "This is the fruit of equivocation (the book whereof was found in Tresham's desk)—to affirm manifest falsehoods upon his salvation, *in ipso articulo mortis*" (*Ibid.* vol. xix. No. 71).

[2] State Trials, ii. p. 240.

said that, had Garnett really desired to keep clear of all such plots, he had authority enough over his subjects to enforce their abstinence from intrigue. But we must remember, if he expected his men to be as sticks in his hand, he on his side was also expected to show the like docility to Parsons and his other superiors; and we have every evidence that, as a good Jesuit, he entered fully and willingly into all the projects of those above him.

James, in Scotland, must have had some inkling of what was going on. In his correspondence with Cecil in 1602, he refers to the Jesuits as being "like venomed wasps and firebrands of sedition," and "far more intolerable than the other sort that seem to profess loyalty."[1] To thwart their attempts, he promised toleration, and writes: "As for the Catholics, I will neither persecute any that will be quiet and give but an outward obedience to the law, neither will I spare to advance any of them that will by good service worthily deserve it."[2] James also opened further communication with the Pope, who now proposed to set up James against all other claimants, and supply him with the necessary funds if he would give up his eldest son to be educated in the Catholic faith. The plan failed. It was probably while these negotiations were pending that Parsons thought it necessary to trim his sails afresh. The old fear of a toleration at the expense of the Jesuits was again uppermost in his mind. It will be difficult to reconcile some of his statements with the truth as the reader now knows it. He writes (7th December 1602) to Fr. Possevino to the effect "that the progress of the faith in England is such, and the converts so numerous and distinguished, as to have induced the enemy to foment discord within the Catholic body; that, moreover, one weapon has been found especially efficacious, namely, to spread abroad the idea that the Fathers of the Society, the leading Catholics, and most especially Parsons himself, are devotees of Spain, and that all which is done, nominally for the conversion of England, is done in fact in the interests of the Spaniards. But this is a manifest calumny, absolutely without foundation. The King of Spain has no

[1] Correspondence of King James VI. with Sir Robert Cecil, p. 36.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 75.

claims to the English Crown, nor have the English Catholics the smallest notion of giving it him. They are indeed desirous to have a Catholic King, and one who would be acceptable to the other sovereigns of Christendom: if the King of Scots would become a Catholic he would be the very man. But although as Catholics the Fathers of the Society cannot but share in this desire, they take no steps on behalf of any claimant whatsoever, and limit themselves to prayers for the good issue of the matter in general. As for himself, he calls God to witness that he would give his life to see the King of Scots a Catholic and succeeding to the throne of England.' In a letter written at the same period, to Spain, he speaks of the solidarity of Jesuits and Spaniards as a slander propagated by the appellants.[1]

The reader by this time has probably become accustomed to Parsons' turn of mind, and, while able to sift the true from the false, will recognise how, by suppressing truth when inconvenient, an entirely false impression is produced.

When Elizabeth died after no long illness (24th March 1603) and James succeeded quietly,[2] Garnett burnt the two Breves of 5th July 1600; and wrote to Parsons (16th April 1603) in the following terms:—

"MY VERY LOVING SIR,—Since my last to you of the 16th of March[3] there hath happened a great alteration by the death of the Queen. Great fears were: but all are turned into greatest security; and a golden time we have of freedom abroad. Yet prisoners are kept very rudely by their keepers belike, because there is, as yet, no authority to release them. The King's coming is uncertain. Yesternight came letter from him; but were not to be opened until this day. Great hope is of toleration; and so general a consent of Catholics in

[1] From *Stonyhurst Archives*, quoted in *The Month*, June 1896, p. 179.

[2] The news arrived in Rome on 19th April, and in a letter from Rome, dated 21st April, the writer tells us how it was received: "Here Parsons and his are struck dead with the news, not of her death, but that the same day King James was proclaimed King of England" (*Archpriest Controversy*, ii. p. 241).

[3] There is probably a letter of an earlier date, giving the news of the accession. It, however, is not at present obtainable.

his proclaiming[1] as it seemeth God will work much. All sorts of religions live in hope and suspense; yet Catholics have great cause to hope for great respect, in that the nobility, all almost labour for it and have good promise thereof from His Majesty: so that if no foreign competitor hinder, the Catholics think themselves well, and would be loath any Catholic princes or His Holiness should stir against the peaceful possession of the kingdom.

"If a Nuncio were addressed from His Holiness to have some conference with the King, I think it would be to good effect, and I suppose he would admit him. The Council and himself will be very willing to [*have*] peace with Spain, which no doubt will be to great good. I hope in time we shall have, not only Mr. Mush's 'port' and 'pace,' but *Flush* also to make up a good rhyme.[2] Only there are some threats against Jesuits as unwilling to [*acknowledge*] His Majesty's title, ready to promote the Spaniard, meddling in matters of state, and authors, especially of the *Book of Succession*. But the principal Catholics, upon so long experience, have another manner of conceit, and labour to work as good a conceit also in the King and the lords as of themselves. Jesuits also besides their procuring to talk with His Majesty in Scotland (which I know not yet whether it was effected or no; and it seemed he had a year ago some hard conceit), they have also written a common letter, to be showed, as written to a gentleman of account, wherein they yield reasons why they are to be trusted and esteemed as well as others. You shall see it when it is gone and know the effect . . . etc."[3]

Thus did Parsons learn that the common sense of the English Catholics had brushed away the webs of the intrigues he had for so long a time pursued in favour of a Spanish

[1] One has to read between the lines in much of the correspondence. Knowing that their letters might fall into the hands of their enemies, the Jesuits were very careful what they said and how they said it. The purport of this letter is to tell Parsons that the Catholics had finally accepted James, and to warn him not to expect any more help from them, then, at the time of the Armada.

[2] I have not been able to make out what this refers to. Mush, it will be remembered, was one of the four appellants.

[3] *Tierney*, iv. p. lxiv.

succession. In spite of the above letter, there seems to have been still a hope lurking in Garnett's heart that a foreign competitor might interfere. Wright, sent off to Spain with the intelligence of James' accession, and with fresh letters from Garnett to Creswell, tried to urge for a renewal of terms. In the June there came from Brussels another messenger, Guy Fawkes, with letters from Fr. Baldwin. But Philip would do nothing.

The letter "to a gentleman of account," showing why the Jesuits were to be trusted and esteemed as others, is still preserved at Stonyhurst. Tierney sums up this remarkable document as follows:[1]—

"The reasons assigned in it, on behalf of the Jesuits are: (1) that Parsons in a letter to the Earl of Angus had sought 'to clear himself of the *Book of Succession*,' that he had 'signified his inclination to His Majesty before any whatsoever, *if* he would maintain Catholic religion,' and that he had spoken so affectionately of the King's mother, that three gentlemen had been imprisoned by Elizabeth, merely for having read the paper in private; (2) that during the last two years the Jesuits had frequently 'sought means to declare their duty to His Majesty if they could have compassed it'; (3) that *since the death of Philip in* 1598 *all thoughts of a Spanish succession had been abandoned and the efforts of the Jesuits had been exerted 'principally for His Majesty'*; (4) that with this view they had constantly promoted a peace with Spain; (5) that the Pope was not likely to resort to any harsh measures with the King; and to inquire, therefore, as to the course which they would adopt in case he 'should excommunicate' him, was 'like to be dishonourable to His Majesty, and to give offence to a most mild pastor without cause'; (6) that the reports of a Jesuit's having attempted the life of the King of France was improbable; (7) that 'the Jesuits had never held it lawful to kill any prince, but such as by violence had unjustly usurped a kingdom';[2] (8) that some Jesuits had assisted His Majesty's mother, during her life, that others were now writing her history, that Parsons had rendered essential

[1] Vol. iv. p. lxv. note.

[2] The *Book of Succession* teaches, however, another doctrine.

ervices to the King himself, in his childhood, and that of the nembers of the Society generally, it might truly be said: take away zeal of Catholic religion, which is in Jesuits as in ther virtuous priests,' and 'there is greatest security of all idelity and loyalty in them'; (9) finally, that during the ife of the King's 'glorious mother,' the Jesuits had prayed laily 'for the Queen of Scotland,' and that 'everywhere the ike affection was always manifested towards His Majesty.' What an alteration would this be, and grief of his best well-vishers, if their annals should publish His Majesty abroad as lienated from those which hoped never to deserve it!"

How are we to reconcile most of these statements with well-known facts?

Parsons in answer to Garnett's letter announcing the quiet accession of James, writes one (now in the Record Office)[1] evidently meant to fall into the hands of the Government. He reports how things are taken in Rome, "to wit, with great contentment of all sorts of men upon hope that our new King will in time suffer himself to be rightly informed in religion, which only point, you know, is the thing that hath held men n suspense these many years who otherwise have loved His Majesty with all their affections . . . in the mean space we do have the best offices we can for His Majesty's service, and shall so continue by God's grace, and already I have appointed both in this and all other seminaries that continually prayers be made with divers fastings and other devotions for the good and prosperous success of His Majesty's affairs. And whereas he last week I received a certain book of His Majesty's entitled *Βασιλικον δωρον* (which is indeed a princely gift and princely work . . .), the reading of this book hath so exceedingly comforted me, as I have imparted also the same comfort to other principal men of this place, and namely, yesterday to His Holiness, who I assure you could scarce hold *his*] tears for comfort to hear certain passages in favour of virtue and hatred to vice which I related to him out of that

[1] Tierney refers to this letter as being addressed to Garnett. The original in the P. O. is addressed *To the right worshipful my very good friend Mr. N. T.* Like he Jesuit paper mentioned above by Garnett, it is most likely to be taken "as written o a gentleman of account."

book . . . I do hear divers ways of sundry attempts in hand and to be taken in hand to hold me in disgrace with His Majesty . . . wherefore I shall desire you heartily to promise that some man not ungrateful to His Majesty do deal with him for me as soon as may be." He then recounts his services to the King; and tries "most sincerely" to put forward Allen, Sir Francis Englefield, "and some others," as the chief author of the *Book of Succession*, leaving the impression that he was not the author. He concludes by asking that the King "will not believe calumnious reports against me without trying first the truth, and, this being once obtained, if it shall please His Majesty to give me leave any further to write to him. I shall do as you from time to time shall advise me of His Highness's pleasure," etc.[1] Even the touching picture of the Pope weeping for comfort did not win the heart of the royal author skilfully though the flattery was applied.

Before the coronation of the King there came out what is known as the "Bye" Plot, in which was concerned poor, foolish William Watson, one of the Clergy who had opposed the Jesuits in the matter of the Archpriest. He, by his scurrilous writings, did his cause more harm than good. Fr. Gerard and Fr. Darcy knew of this plot in April 1603, and were asked to join in it. But, as it would interfere with the one their party were then concerned in, Gerard informed Garnett and urged him to get the Archpriest to forbid Catholics to take any part in it. In June, just when the plot was ripe, Gerard told a friend at Court to warn the King. But he was too late. Garnett and Blackwell had already given information to the Government.

Poor William Watson was betrayed by the man who, two years after, would not betray his friend Catesby; and the virulent opponent of the Jesuits expiated his treason on the scaffold. To put this matter of Watson's fate in its true light, we must remember that almost at the very time Garnett informed against Watson, the Jesuits were participating in Wright's and Fawkes' attempt to induce Philip to invade England.

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. i. No. 84.

[2] Fr. Gerard in his MS. account of the Gunpowder Plot (quoted by Tierney, iv. p. li.) is the authority for this.

We now come to the consideration of the Gunpowder treason. But before directly entering upon the matter, so far as the Jesuits were concerned, it will be necessary to point out what really lead up to this treason. We have seen the failure of the attempt of June 1603 to interest Spain. James, since the discovery of the several plots which greeted his arrival, had tried to get the Pope not only to promise not to excommunicate him, but also to threaten with ecclesiastical censure all who should oppose him. But this Clement would not do. He fenced with the question. He was willing to make all manner of concessions in other ways. "The Pope's Nuncio," writes Parry from Paris to Cecil (20th August 1603), 'sent me a message, the effect of which was that he had received authority and a mandate from Rome to call out of the King our master's dominions the factious and turbulent priests and Jesuits . . . offering for the first trial of his sincere meaning that if there remained any in his dominions, priest or Jesuit, or other busy Catholic, whom he had intelligence of for a practice in the State which could not be found out, upon advertisement of the names he would find means that by ecclesiastical censures they should be delivered unto his justice."[1] Dr. Giffard was sent over to England by the Nuncio (August 1603) to assure the King personally of this. But the proposal met with considerable resistance from those who surrounded James. Cecil, answering Parry, says of the business, "for mine own part it is so tender as I could have wished I had little dealt in it." It would be about this time that Garnett had introduced his scheme of procuring, "if money may be gotten, the friendship of some special councillors,"[2] and contemporary evidence[3] goes to show that Cecil had been approached upon the subject. He could hardly have been now willing to forward the Pope's policy and cause the banishment of the Jesuits, who proposed to be his paymaster. The Pope, however, from fear of arousing the jealousy of

[1] S. P. O. France.

[2] *Contributions towards a Life of Father Henry Garnett*, by Fr. Gerard, p. 60.

[3] Garnett writing to Parsons: "Mr. Ant. Copley . . . answered that the Jesuits had corrupted Sir Robert Cecil, and to cross them in their proceedings my friends and myself had devised this plot" (*ibid.*). Another plan of Garnett's in the autumn of 1604 was to suggest that Rome should find the money to buy toleration.

Spain and France, would not give the guarantees Jame demanded. The King's irritation was nursed by Cecil, an advantage was taken of the great increase in the number recusants to point out, as Dr. S. R. Gardiner says, "that if th Roman Catholics of England increased in future years rapidly as they had increased in the first year of the reig it would not be long before a Pope would be found ready launch against James the excommunication which had bee launched against Elizabeth, and that his throne would shaken, together with that natural independence which tha throne supplied."[1]

"Watson's King," as the Jesuits called him, had said whe once on his throne: "Na, na, gud fayth, wee's not neede th papist now";[2] but there was evidently still some lingerin desire to keep faith with them. Pushed on by his Council, attempted a compromise. The laity were to be left alone but the priests must be banished. A proclamation to th effect was issued on 22nd February 1604, and this resulte immediately in the Gunpowder Plot.

In the March two friends of Garnett's, namely, Catesby an Winter, met and originated the treason. They confided Fawkes, Percy, and John Wright; and early in the followin May the five conspirators met in a house behind St. Clement Church in the Strand, and there took an oath of secrecy an fidelity. They then went into an adjoining room, where priest was waiting to say Mass, and confirmed their oath b receiving communion together. It is generally held, on th confession of Fawkes, that the priest was Fr. Gerard. H however, denies the fact; and the late Fr. Morris argues th Fawkes mistook another priest for the Jesuit.[3] Be this it may, there is no direct evidence, whatever the probabiliti

[1] *What Gunpowder Plot was*, p. 159.

[2] S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. ii. No. 51.

[3] *Life of Fr. Gerard*, p. 437. But Thomas Winter and Fawkes both declare t it was Gerard. He, Morris, argues that Fawkes was a stranger, and as he had b abroad did not know Gerard, and says that there is no evidence that Winter had intercourse with Gerard. If Father Morris had found that there was evidence t Winter, who was a visitor at White Webbs, had no intercourse with Gerard, he wo have gained his point. As it is, he only raises objections which tend to a confus of the evidence.

may be, for supposing the Jesuit had any knowledge of what was taking place in the adjoining chamber. Indeed, Fawkes, if he is to be believed, distinctly says (9th November 1605) the contrary: "But he saith that Gerard was not acquainted with their purpose."[1] The conspirators, wishing to add to their oath a participation of the most solemn ordinance of their religion, would naturally have chosen a time and a place where they could assist at Mass in the house of a common friend.

We do not intend to go into the details of the plot, excepting so far as they concern the Jesuits. Of late several books have appeared upon the subject. The Very Reverend John Gerard, the present Provincial of the Jesuits, in his brilliant essay *What was the Gunpowder Plot?*[2] set himself the task of raising doubts about certain details in the accepted story. While avoiding altogether the question of Garnett's complicity, he sums up his work by stating boldly "that the true history of the Gunpowder Plot is now known to no man, and that the history commonly received is certainly untrue."[3] Two points he establishes, which hitherto have been generally accepted by most historians, namely, that the Government knew something of the plot before the famous letter to Lord Monteagle,[4] and that they used to the best advantage whatever information they afterwards gathered. Dr. Gardiner has had no trouble, in his masterly book, *What Gunpowder Plot was*, in demolishing Father Gerard's attempt to throw doubt on the plot itself. His two chapters, "The Government and the Catholics" and "The Government and the Priests," are a magnificent piece of historical work, which must be studied by all who approach the subject.

Catholics were still hoping against hope that the treaty with Spain would procure them toleration. Garnett evidently feared an outbreak if they found themselves disappointed. Writing on 29th August 1604, he says that these "Catholics

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. xvi. No. 38, *Declaration of Guy Fawkes.*

[2] This book seems to have been written with the purpose of clearing Fr. Garnett from any participation in the plot.

[3] P. 234.

[4] The authorship of this letter is almost as mysterious as that of "Junius." From a remark of Garnett, given below, it would not seem improbable that the letter came from a Jesuit.

will no more be quiet. What shall we do? Jesuits cannot hinder it. Let (*the*) Pope forbid all Catholics to stir." Was this the remark of a man who was only an acute observer of the tendency of the times, or does it show that he wrote from knowledge of what was likely to be going on below the surface?

The Pope had indeed forbidden the priests to take part in any disturbance. One of the conspirators, Sir Everard Digby, throws some light upon Garnett's possible attitude towards any suspicions or knowledge he may have had. Writing from the Tower, he tells his wife: "Before I knew anything of the plot, I did ask Mr. Farmer[1] what the meaning of the Pope's Breve was: he told me that they were not (meaning priests) to undertake or procure stirs; but yet they would not hinder any, neither was it the Pope's mind they should, that should be undertaken for the Catholic good. I did never utter this much, nor would to you; and this answer with Mr. Catesby's proceedings with him and me, gave me absolute belief that the matter in general was approved, though every particular was not known."[2]

This being Garnett's mind, it is not at all improbable he may have had more than a bare suspicion of what was going on among his friends. At any rate, he knew them as the party in favour of force. Meanwhile he had cause for alarm: and the action the Jesuits took caused a coolness between them and the rest of the Catholics. Garnett's scheme for buying a toleration had failed. Now another was on foot which might be successful at the cost of the Society.

Dom Augustine White (*alias* Bradshaw), a Benedictin monk, writes that he had been approached by "all the chief Catholics of England to deal with the ambassador . . . of Spain D. Juan de Tassis, about the buying of a toleration for three score thousand pounds. When he had brought it to such a point that by them (*Jesuits*) it was thought certain, they went about to discredit me with the ambassador, and th

[1] Garnett's *aliases* were Farmer, Marchant, Whalley, Darcey, Meaze, Phillip Humphrey, Roberts, Fulgeham, Allen.

[2] Barlow's *The Gunpowder Treason*, Digby Papers, No. 9.

mbassador with the Catholics, which, when they could not do, hey must needs persuade them that Fr. Parsons was the only it man to manage the business."[1] There seems to have been nurmurs among the Catholics of both parties that the Jesuits vere consulting the interests of "ours" before the common good.

Early in May 1605 Garnett knew that some action was ontemplated. Writing to Parsons, 8th May 1605, he says: All are desperate here, divers Catholics are offended with esuits; they say that Jesuits do impugn and hinder all orcible enterprises. I dare not inform myself of their affairs ecause of the prohibition of Father General for meddling in uch affairs.[2] And so I cannot give you [*an*] exact account: his I know by mere chance."[3] And yet within a month we nd him with Catesby, and without "informing himself of their ffairs," he got sufficient information. But Catesby, finding arnett standing somewhat aloof from old friends, determined o get from him a pronouncement which would reassure some f his fellow-conspirators who began to doubt. The Jesuits ere famous for solving cases of conscience; so one was roposed to Garnett. Going on 9th June 1605 to Garnett's dging in Thames Street, "at the house of one Bennett, a ostermonger, hard by Queenhithe,"[4] Catesby put the question: hether it was lawful to kill innocent persons together with e guilty? The case was supposed to be that of a siege. arnett solved the case by saying it was lawful. Whereupon atesby made solemn protestation, so says Garnett, "that would never be known to have asked me any such estion so long as he lived."[5] The seventeenth century erard says: "With which Mr. Catesby, seeming fully satisd, made off presently into other talk; the father at that ne little imagining whereat he aimed; though afterwards, nen the matter was known, he told some friends what had ssed between Mr. Catesby and him about this matter, and

[1] Letter of White's in the *Westminster Archives*.

[2] We have seen, in the case of Parsons, how formal orders of the very highest nority were given with one hand and dispensed with the other.

[3] Gerard's *Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot* (ed. 1872), p. 75.

[4] S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. xix. No. 40.

[5] Hatfield MS. Garnett's *Declaration*, 9th March 1606. See *The English torical Review*, 1889, p. 511.

that he little suspected that he would so have applied th general doctrine of divines to the practices of a private and s perilous a case without expressing all the particulars. Now Mr. Catesby having found as much as he thought needful fo his purpose, related the same unto the rest of the conspirators and all were animated in their proceedings without any furthe scruple, for a long time; but applied all, by their own divinity unto their own case."[1] It is, however, impossible to avoi censuring Garnett gravely for such a reply to Catesby Knowing by experience he was engaged in plots, the Jesui had no right to dismiss that knowledge from the presen case. Ordinary prudence demanded, under all the circum stances, that he should have refused to give a merely theoretica answer to an imaginary case. If we give Garnett the benef of the doubt, he affords on this occasion a proof of the correct ness of the opinion of his General, who hesitated to send hir on the mission as "a sheep among wolves."

It appears, however, that Garnett, on reflecting, did hav some misgivings. "After this I began to muse with myse what this should mean, and fearing lest he should intend th death of some great persons, and, by seeking to draw ther together, enwrap not only innocents but friends and necessar persons for the Commonwealth,[2] I thought I would take f occasion to admonish him that upon my speech he should nc run headlong to so great a mischief; which I did after at th house in Essex when he came with my Lord Monteagle an Francis Tresham. For walking in the gallery with him alon my lord standing afar off, I told him that upon that questio lately asked I had mused much with myself, and wished hir to look what he did, if he intended anything, that he must firs look to the lawfulness of the act itself, and then he must nc have so little regard for innocents that he spared not friend and necessary persons for a Commonwealth, and told him wha charge we had of all quietness and to procure the like i others; of this point we had more conference[3] at our nex

[1] Tierney (translating Gerard's *Narrative*), vol. iv. p. 46, note.

[2] These words suggest the origin of the letter to Lord Monteagle.

[3] "Soon after this Mr. Catesby came again, as he was seldom long from us; f the great affection he bore the gentlewoman with whom I lived and unto me, etc (Garnett's *Declaration*, p. 512).

meeting, as I will say hereafter. 'O, saith he, let me alone for that, for do you not see how I seek to enter into new familiarity with this lord'? which made me imagine that he intended something amongst the nobility."[1]

Evidently Garnett did understand Catesby's case to mean that he "intended" something. This must have confirmed the knowledge he evidently had in May "by mere chance." To protect himself in case of any mishap, he thought it well to write to his superiors upon the general subject, and take the opportunity of sounding his friends in Essex, "the more to confirm the Pope in that course which verily he desired."[2] So he asked them if they thought the Catholics "were able to make their part good by arms against the King." Lord Monteagle replied: "If ever they were, they are able now; and then added the reason, The King (saith he) is so odious to all sorts." But pressing for a categorical reply, they answered in the negative. "Why then, saith I, you see how some do wrong the Jesuits, saying that they hinder Catholics from helping themselves; and how it importeth us all to be quiet, and so we must and will be."[3]

It is said that Garnett wrote to his General to give him warning. I have not been able to find any evidence for this statement. He evidently thought that he and his subjects would be able to repress an outbreak which now could only end in disaster for themselves. But the Pope had heard some mischief was brewing; and he ordered Aquaviva to write the following letter to Garnett, which is dated 25th June 1605: "We have heard, although clearly and very secretly, what I am persuaded your reverence knows, that the Catholics are planning something for liberty; but as such an attempt, especially at this time, will bring not only many and grave inconveniences to religion, but will call into question the whole body of Catholics, our Holy Father orders me to write to your Reverence[4] in his name that you should use all your influence with these noblemen and gentlemen, especially with the Archpriest, that nothing of the sort should be discussed or carried

[1] *Ibid.* p. 511. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*

[4] It may be noted that the General does not refer to any previous order of his own; nor does Garnett in his reply. It would seem that Garnett's reference to such an order in the letter to Parsons of 8th May may have been only a device in case the letter fell into the Government's hands. A letter was also sent to Blackwell.

out on account of the above-mentioned causes, especially because of the orders of His Holiness, who not only does not in any way approve of such plans being proposed by Catholics, but asserts that the result will be to hinder the greater good which in clemency and kindness His Holiness already has in mind and strives to effect. And as it is certain that His Holiness never is nor will be wanting in planning as I have said, and seeking such means as with peace and more quiet times may succeed, therefore, as your Reverence well understands the seriousness and necessity of the matter, you must strive your utmost that all such thoughts should be set aside. For to the above reasons, which are very great and weighty, this other, which is not to be despised and is also for the welfare of the Catholics: viz. if it should happen, which God avert, there will be no small injury to our Society, for it will be difficult for anyone to believe that it was done without the consent of ours."[1]

This letter was shown to Catesby in the July, and Garnett "admonished him of the Pope's pleasure. I doubted he had some device in his head; whatsoever it was, being against the Pope's will, it would not prosper. He said that what he meant to do, if the Pope knew, he would not hinder, for the general good of our country. But I being earnest with him, and inculcating the Pope's prohibition, who, amongst other reasons of his prohibition, did add this: *quia expresse hoc Papa non vult et prohibet*, he told me he was not bound to take knowledge by me of the Pope's will. I said indeed my own credit was but little, but our General, whose letter I had read unto him, was a man everywhere respected for his wisdom and virtue. So I desired him that before he attempted anything he would acquaint the Pope. He said he would not for all the world make his particular project known to him, for fear of discovery. I wished him, at the last, to inform him how things stood here by some lay-gentlemen. . . . I myself propounded Sir Edward Baynham, who was already determined to go into Flanders; but that I would not be the author of his going further than Flanders, for that the Pope would not take well that we should busy ourselves in sending messengers. Sir

[1] Dom. Jac. I. vol. xiv. No. 41.

Edward came to me. I desired him to go to the Nuncio in Flanders and inform him how things went, but not in my name."[1] Garnett was now evidently alarmed.

His reply to his General is dated 24th July 1605. He says:

"We have received your letters, and accept them with all the reverence due to His Holiness, and your Paternity. For my part four times up to the present I have hindered disturbances. Nor is there any doubt that we can prevent all public taking up of arms, as it is certain that many Catholics would never attempt anything of this sort without our consent, except under the pressure of a great necessity. But two things make us very anxious. The first is lest any in some one province should fly to arms, and that the very necessity should compel others to like courses. For there are not a few who will not be kept back by a mere prohibition of His Holiness. There are some who dared to ask, when Pope Clement was alive, whether the Pope could prohibit their defending their lives. They further say that no priest shall know their secrets; and of us by name even some friends complain that we put an obstacle in the way of their plans. Now to soften these in some way, and at least to gain time, that by delay some fitting remedy may be applied, we have advised them that by common consent they should send some one to the Holy Father, which they have done, and I have sent him into Flanders to the Nuncio that he may commend him to His Holiness, and I have sent by him letters explaining their opinions and the reasons on both sides. These letters are written at some length as they will be carried very safely. And this for the first danger. The other is somewhat worse, for the danger is lest secretly some treason or violence be shown to the King, and so all Catholics may be compelled to take arms. Wherefore in my judgment two things are necessary: first, that His Holiness should prescribe what in any case is to be done; and then, that he should forbid any force of arms to the Catholics, under censure and by Breve publicly promulgated, an occasion for which can be taken from the disturbance lately raised in Wales, which has at length come to nothing. It remains that as all things are daily

[1] Garnett's *Declaration*, pp. 512, 513.

becoming worse, we should beseech His Holiness so to give a necessary remedy for these great dangers, and we ask his blessing and that of your Paternity."[1]

At the very time Garnett was writing (24th July) he had received details of the plot, though in a manner, it is contended, he thought he could not use. In his examination (12th March 1606) he confesses that "a little before St James-tide at Fremland in Essex near Sir Ken. Sulyardes," Fr. Greenway revealed to him the details of the plot. As St. James' Feast falls on the 25th of July, Garnett knew of the plot before that date.

It is said that Greenway obtained his knowledge of the plot by means of the confessional. Indeed, he asserts this "on his salvation"; and Lingard accepts the statement.[3] But Garnett, as far as he is a reliable witness, does not bear out Greenway's assertion. The whole evidence goes to prove the contrary. On both occasions when Catesby spoke of the matter to Garnett, the latter says: "he offered to tell me of his plot the first time he said he had not leave, but would get leave the second he had gotten leave, but I refused to know, considering the prohibition I had, etc."[4] There is here a clear case that Catesby was willing to inform Garnett; but there is no question of any sacramental secret. Of course it is probable that the communication would have been made under the same pledge of secrecy that bound the other con-

[1] Gerard's *Narrative*, p. 77, note. [2] Dom. Jac. I. vol. xix. No. 40.

[3] "Catesby, whatever he might pretend to his associates, still felt occasional misgivings of conscience, and on that account resolved to open the whole matter in confession to Greenway. That Jesuit, if we may believe his solemn asseveration, condemned the design in most pointed terms. But Catesby was not to be convinced: to every objection he solicited Greenway to procure the opinion of the Provincial under the secrecy of confession. With this view the Jesuit applied to Garnett, and received in return a severe reprimand. He had done wrong to entertain any mention of so dangerous a project; he had done worse in imparting it to his superior. Nothing now remained but to divert the conspirator from his sanguinary purpose. Let him therefore employ every argument, every expedient in his power; but at the same time let him be careful to keep the present conversation secret from every living man, even from Catesby himself" (*History*, vol. vii. pp. 60, 61). The judicious reader from the facts to be set forth in the text will be forced to the conclusion that Lingard trusted too confidently to Greenway's assertions "on his salvation."

[4] *Declaration*, p. 513.

spirators; and if this was sufficient in Garnett's case, it would also suffice in Greenway, who was an old friend in treason with Catesby. Moreover, in the words in which Garnett describes the way in which Greenway made his confidence, there is no hint given that the knowledge had come to the latter in the confessional.[1]

Within a few days after Catesby had made his offer, Greenway came to Garnett. "And walking with me," says Garnett, "in my chamber (*he*) seemed much perplexed; he said he had a thing in his mind which he would fain tell me;[2] but that he was bound to silence,[3] and it was about some device of Mr. Catesby. I said that in truth I had an inkling of some matter intended by him, and that he was desirous to acquaint me, but that I refused to hear him in respect of the prohibition we had from Rome, and of the danger of the matter at home; and so we walked long together, as it were, in a balance, whether he would tell me or I give him the hearing. At last I told him that if he heard the matter out of confession he might tell it me with a safe conscience, because Mr. Catesby had offered to tell me himself, and so it might be presumed that it should not be an injury to him or breach of promise. As for myself, I desired to know, so that he would never be known to Mr. Catesby or others that he had told me, and hereof afterwards I gave him also a special charge. He said that in regard of his promise of secrecy, he not being master of other

[1] But at the time when Greenway asserted "on his salvation" that he had heard about the plot in the confessional, there was a truth. For although Catesby had not told him in the confessional, Bates, a servant to Catesby, had given him the information under those circumstances. Hence Greenway's assertion must be taken with the mental reservation: "Bates, I mean, not Catesby." Greenway indeed denies that Bates ever spoke to him on the subject, but, as Bates was then dead and could not prove the fact, it does not seem improbable that Greenway followed the avowed policy of his superior, and was ready to deny an adverse truth until it could be proved against him. The position of Greenway when he made this statement was a precarious one. Had he not purged himself by oath, there were to be feared prisons at Rome or galleys elsewhere.

[2] Gerard in his narrative says: Greenway came for a double purpose—(1) to make his own confession; (2) to consult his superior *sub sigillo* as to what should be done in regard of the plot lately disclosed in confession to himself. But as far as we have evidence at first hand, we are in a position to hold—(1) that Greenway knew of the plot outside of confession; (2) that he did not come to make his confession; (3) neither did he come to consult but to *inform* Garnett, who in his turn "desired to know."

[3] Evidently by the Conspirators' oath.

men's secrets, he would not tell it me but by way of confession for to have my direction;[1] but because it were too tedious to relate so long a discourse in confession kneeling, if I would take it as in confession walking, and afterwards take his confession kneeling, either then or at any other time, he would tell me; and so discovered unto me all the matter as it is publicly known abroad . . . Thus the matter being opened unto me, I was amazed, and said it was a most horrible thing never heard of the like . . . I could in no way like of it, and charged him to hinder it if he could, for he knew well enough what strict prohibition we had. He said that in truth he had disclaimed it; and protested that he did not approve it, and that he would do what lay in him to dissuade it. How he performed it after I have not heard,[2] but by the report of Bates his confession, which may chance to be of small account, both for the desire he might have of his life, and of the breach of the secret of confession, for the penitent in matter of weight is bound to secrecy as well as the confessor. . . . So we parted yet with the compact that if ever I should be called in question for being accessory unto such a horrible action, either by the Pope or by my superiors beyond the sea, or by the state here, I would have liberty to utter all that passed in this conference, which he gave me."[3]

What was the necessity for Greenway to tell Garnett anything about the matter? It is difficult to see. It was not as a matter of fact, for the purpose of asking advice; for "he knew well enough what strict prohibition we had." He also knew his duty in the matter. It seems in reality only to have been done for the purpose of communicating information to his superior, or for self-excusing. The secret was not told as a part of sacramental confession, which is concerned with the accusation of one's own sins, "but (says Garnett) by way of

[1] These words are worth noting. Greenway was telling other men's secrets to Garnett, and put him under a sacramental seal concerning them. He told them Garnett says, for the sake of direction. This revelation was before Greenway's sacramental confession, which does not seem to have been made on that day. It is necessary to bear in mind that the two revelations were distinct acts.

[2] And yet, as will be seen, Garnett confesses that as often as they met he spoke of the matter.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 513–5.

confession, which may be done in conference of private points, or need of study, or want of time, though it be a good while after. Being asked how often they conferred of this? He saith, so often as they met he would ask, being careful of the matter, but new questions he did ask him none."[1] It is difficult then to see how the question of a sacramental seal comes into the matter at all.[2] Indeed, Garnett is not consistent with himself on this plea of sacramental secrecy. He varies his story according to circumstances. Before his trial he asserts that Greenway told him the secret in confession. After the trial, when he thought Greenway was in custody, he said "that he cannot certainly affirm that Greenway intended to relate the matter to him under the seal of confession; and it might be that such was not his intention, though he always supposed it was."[3] When he was pressed in his examination on 25th April "whether he took Greenway's discovery to be in confession or no?" he replied, "That it was not a confession, but by way of confession." He also declared (4th April) that "as often as they met" he spoke of the matter to Greenway;[4] and excuses himself by saying "that all these latter conferences had relation to the first, and consequently to confession."[5]

Greenway's communication was of the same nature as that of a client with his lawyer—a natural secret and no more. It was not in any way a confession of personal sins concerning which the seal exists. As regards the obligation of preserving this particular secret, it may be well to add here what a Jesuit writer, whose works seem to have been known to one at least of the conspirators,[6] has to say on the subject. Writing in 1593

[1] Examination, 25th April 1606, Dom. Jac. I. vol. xx. No. 44.

[2] Gerard, who, when uncorroborated with other evidence, is generally untrustworthy in his story of the Gunpowder Plot (he had not the means of knowing the facts), says: "One of them disclosed the matter in confession to one of our fathers, which was already ripe for execution, who refused to hear him any further unless he was allowed to inform his superior" (*Autobiography*, ed. 1886, p. 256). There is no evidence to support this statement, and Garnett's declaration shows it to be quite imaginary.

[3] Garnett's letter to the King (6th April), Abbot's *Antilogia*, p. 140.

[4] He asked him "who was to be chosen Protector when the King and Houses of Parliament were destroyed?" Dom. Jac. I. vol. xx. No. 44.

[5] *Antilogia*, p. 140.

[6] Sir Everard Digby writes: "I saw the principal point of the case judged in a Latin book of M. D." Barlow, *The Gunpowder Treason*, p. 249.

Father Martin Del Rio strangely enough takes the very case of a Gunpowder Plot: "For instance, a criminal confesses that he or some other person has placed gunpowder or other such-like under a certain house, and that unless it be removed the house will be burnt, the sovereign killed, and as many as go in or out of the city destroyed or brought into great danger. In such a case almost all doctors, with few exceptions, assert [that the confessor may reveal it] if he take due care that neither directly nor indirectly he draws into suspicion of the sin the one confessing."[1] But he adds that the contrary opinion is the safer. Bellarmine also says: "If the person confessing be concealed, it is lawful for a priest to break the seal of confession in order to avert a great calamity."[2] But he excuses Garnett by saying it was not lawful for him to declare a treasonable secret to an heretical King, who had no reverence for the sacrament of confession, and who could have constrained him by torture to declare the person who had confessed the criminal design. Upon this Bishop Andrews[3] in his reply caustically remarks: "Therefore it follows from this argument that it is lawful and justifiable to blow up such a King with gunpowder"; and (he might have added) that fear of punishment is a sufficient excuse for disobeying the moral law.

Poor Garnett, in the position he now found himself, deserves, at least, our pity. He had wanted to find out the ins and outs of the business without being known. The result of this itching to know what was going on made him miserable. "Now I," says he, "remained in the greatest perplexity that ever I was in in my life, and could not sleep at nights, so that when I saw him [*Greenway*] next, I telling him so much, he said he was sorry he had ever told me."[4] On this occasion the bewildered man said: "Good Lord, if this matter go forward, the Pope will send me to the galleys, for he will assuredly think I was privy to it."

[1] Del Rio, *Disquisitionum Magicarum*, iii. p. 157. The edition before me bears on the title-page the date 1600, but the date of the dedication of this volume is 1616. The author refers in this passage to the case of Garnett, "who seems to have held" the so-called safer opinion.

[2] *Apologia pro Responsione* (ed. 1610), p. 244.

[3] *Responsio ad Bell. Apol.* (ed. 1610), p. 316.

[4] Garnett's *Declaration*, p. 515.

One result of Greenway's disclosure was to make Garnett withdraw in measure from Catesby's company. It was too risky. "Neither," says he, "did I enter further with him then, as I wrote, but rather cast off all occasion (after I knew of his project) of any discoursings with him of it, thereby to save myself harmless both with the state here and with my superiors at Rome.[1] But there was no open rupture; for "about Bartholomew-tide (*24th August*) he spoke with Catesby at Moorfields, and not of that matter."[2]

Knowing then that it was intended to blow up Parliament on 3rd October, he considered it evidently safer to withdraw for a while from London. On 29th August he left town for a pilgrimage to St. Winifrid's well, "for his health, to shake off the business about London,"[3] and to do what good he could at friends' houses by the way, both going and coming, until a fit house could be provided for him,[4] where he might settle for the winter. But before he started on the pilgrimage he wrote (4th September 1605) to Parsons to this effect: "As far as I can now see, the minds of the Catholics are quieted, and they are determined to bear with patience the troubles of persecution for the time to come; not indeed without hope that either the King himself or at least his son will grant some relief to their oppressions. In the meantime the number of Catholics is much increased; and I hope that my present journey, which, God willing, I mean to commence to-morrow, will not be without good effect upon the Catholic cause."[5] This letter is fatal to Garnett. Already he knew everything about the plot: he was about to make a journey in the company of several of the conspirators, and yet within a few weeks of the assembling of Parliament he wilfully deceived his superiors, Parsons, and the Pope himself, as to the disposition of the Catholics in England. Whatever he might have done at a former date to induce the Pope to interfere is discounted by the fact that on the eve of the explosion he wrote to Rome a letter which gives the idea that all such interference was unnecessary. This letter would make one believe that Garnett had now thrown himself heart

[1] Garnett's *Further Declaration*, p. 517.
[2] S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. xix. No. 40.
[3] *Declaration*, p. 515.
[4] His London houses were discovered.
[5] Eudæmon-Joannes's *Apologia*, p. 256.

and soul into the plot, and was afraid of any adverse sentiment from Rome.

The pilgrimage consisted of about thirty persons, and took some two weeks. It started from Gothurst in Buckinghamshire, the seat of Sir Everard Digby.[1] The last part of the journey the ladies of the party went barefooted. Arrived at Holywell, one whole night was spent in devotional exercises. On their way back they called at Harrowden, where they found Catesby. A few days after, Sir Everard invited Garnett, Anne Vaux, and Catesby to his house at Gothurst, fifteen miles off; and it was on the journey thither that Catesby inveigled his host into the plot.

The authorities in Rome were evidently not satisfied with Garnett's reply of 24th July; for he received letters from Parsons at the end of September ordering him "to advertise him what plots the Catholics of England had then in hand."[2]

Garnett did not know what to do. Parliament had been again prorogued until 5th November, and his awful secret was still burning in his brain. To go nearer London? That might seem a proof of innocence. Or should he go further away? A letter written 4th October to Parsons reveals his distress of mind. "We are to go within a few days nearer London; yet are we unprovided of a house, nor can find any convenient for any long time. But we must fain to borrow some private house for a time, and live more privately until this great storm may be blown over." This letter, however, was not sent till the 21st, on which date there is a postscript.[3] By that time Garnett had changed his mind; and instead of going nearer London, on 29th October he travelled with Lady Digby, Anne Vaux and her sister, Mrs. Brooksby, to Coughton.

These movements are natural to a man in the unhappy

[1] Rookwood, one of the conspirators, was of the party; and the pilgrims rested, going and coming, at the houses of two others mixed up in the plots, *i.e.* J. Grant and R. Winter.

[2] This will go to show that in Rome at that date Garnett was understood by Parsons to be in a position to give him all necessary information about any plots.

[3] *Tierney*, vol. iv. p. ciii. This letter is sometimes brought forward to prove that Garnett did not then (4th) know of the particulars of the plot, which are said to have been revealed to him about 21st October. But as we now know Garnett learnt all particulars before 25th July. Greenway, Lingard, Tierney have accepted this date; and Fr. Morris, S.J., seems to have fallen into the common error.

state Garnett was in. To brave it out or to hide? Whatever he did would tell against him. He was being caught in nets of his own weaving.

He was at Coughton for the feast of All Saints (2nd November), and preached. He was charged later on that he then offered prayers publicly for some good success in the Catholic cause and quoted in his sermon the words:

> "*Gentem repelle perfidam*
> *Fidelium de finibus;*
> *Ut Christo laudes debitas*
> *Persolvamus alacriter.*"

His choice of quotation was singularly unhappy. It could have been impossible for a man like Garnett not to have seen the application to the secret that was weighing him down. But, on the other hand, it was natural; for the quotation was taken from the hymn at Vespers for that day, and had been specially indulgenced by Gregory XIII. at the request of Allen. It would not be the first time, however, that a preacher has one application in his mind and his hearers another.

When the plot failed, the chief conspirators fled. Catesby with others made their way to Coughton, and his exclamation when Greenway appeared—"Here at least is a gentleman that would live and die with them"—seems to prove that his reception by Garnett was not favourable, but the reverse. Still, Greenway was allowed to ride off with his fellow-conspirators. He made his way to Hinlip, and told them, so says Fr. Oldcorne, of the failure of the plot; and, angry at their refusal to join, hurried off to rouse up the Catholics in Lancashire.[1] This failing, he eventually made his way in disguise to London, where one day, while standing at a street corner reading the proclamation for his arrest, he noticed one of the bystanders comparing his person with the description given. As Greenway moved away, the man came up and said, "You are known. I arrest you in the King's name; you must come with me to the Council." Greenway assured him he was mistaken, but went off quietly with him until they came to an unfrequented street, where, being a powerful man, he suddenly

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. xix. No. 16.

sprang upon his captor and, after a violent struggle, managed to escape. He left London at once, and, passing through Essex, succeeded in reaching the Continent.

Gerard remained in hiding in London during the whole of Lent, and then also found safety abroad. But Garnett stayed at Coughton until 4th December, when he and Anne Vaux went to Hinlip Castle, the seat of Thomas Abington,[1] ten miles out of Worcester, where Fr. Oldcorne had been living for twelve years.

As soon as the Government discovered the existence of a plot, they concluded that the Jesuits were its originators. It was known by past history that Jesuits had been mixed up in plots, and that the men already captured were friends of Garnett's and other Jesuits. It was therefore not beyond the bounds of probability that they might be found implicated. So as soon as the Council learnt from the confessions of some of their prisoners the names of three Jesuits who were in some way mixed up in the plot, a proclamation was issued for their arrest.

The Proclamation (15th January 1606) preserves for us the personal traits of the Jesuits, whom the Government declared had "all three peculiarly been practisers" in the plot.

"John Gerard *alias* Brooke: of stature tall and according thereunto well set: his complexion swart or blackish: his cheeks sticking out and somewhat hollow underneath the cheeks: the hair of his head long, if it be not cut off: his beard cut close, saving little mustachoes, and a little tuft under his lower lip: about forty years old.

"Henry Garnett *alias* Walley *alias* Darcy *alias* Farmer: of a middling stature, full-faced, fat of body, of complexion fair: his forehead high on each side with a little thin hair coming down upon the midst of the fore part of his head: the hair of his head and beard grizzled; of age between fifty and three score: his beard on his cheeks cut close, on his chin but thin and somewhat short: his gait upright and comely for a fat man.

"Oswald Tesmond *alias* Greenway: of mean stature, somewhat gross: his hair black; his beard bushy and brown, something long: a broad forehead, and about forty years of age."

[1] The name appears in various forms: Abbingdon, Hadington, and Adington.

From his hiding-place at Coughton Garnett wrote the following letter to the Privy Council (30th November 1605):—

"My very Honourable and Good Lords,—After twenty years almost complete in this employment (of a missionary), by the appointment of God and my superiors; being newly charged, as I understand, with the late most horrible attempt, as if I had been accessory thereunto, and in particular had to such intent given the most holy sacrament to six of the confederates at the very undertaking so bloody an enterprise, I humbly crave your honours' patience, if for the honour of God and the Catholic cause and particularly of the Order of which I am a member, and have in this kingdom some special charge, I say somewhat with all possible brevity, for my just purgation, though as I hope, this my disgrace ariseth rather of calumnious reports than of any material accusation. If, therefore, it may please His Majesty and your honours to afford the credit of an honest man, hitherto by God's grace unstained, unto a Catholic religious priest, tied by vow of obedience to his General and to the Pope, even in this particular case; one also who hopeth for everlasting salvation and dreadeth the most strict and severe judgment of Almighty God. By these titles, bonds, hopes and fears, I protest that howsoever in spiritual matters and acts of charity which I have to afford to all sorts, some of this unfortunate company may chance to have had my help and assistance, yet in this enterprise, as unfit for me to deal in as it was bloody in itself, they never made me privy, much less asked my consent to their purposes. To this testimony of God which is the greatest that can possibly be found or imagined, I add a most excellent witness on earth, which is the Pope himself, who very well knoweth, and I doubt not will testify if need be, that I procured an *express prohibition* of all unquietness (under occasion of Watson's plot and other fears) which were here divulged by the most reverend Archpriest, and I thereupon certified His Holiness and assured him of all quietness of Catholics in general, in respect that no public tumult could be intended but some of us might know it, and so by all possible means hinder it. But because in so afflicted

a number it were to be feared that some private persons, forgetting all Christian patience and longanimity, as experience of other countries besides our own hath taught us, might break out into fury, I wished a *prohibition under censures* of all violence towards His Majesty or his officers, reputing it as a great stay to all Catholics from such outrages, if such things (as might be hidden from us or other quiet persons, especially reverend priests, and therefore not possible to be hindered by any industry of our own) were avoided by terror of dying in the most horrible state of *excommunication*, to their utter perdition of body and soul, of whatever conspirators. And this, my motion, I doubt not but will take good effect hereafter by occasion of this late conspiracy. That it was not done before it is like the only cause hath been either want of time or hope of regard of all Catholics to the *bare commandment* of so eminent a person in all Christianity.

"And I will here, for the next testimony of my clearness and innocence, in the third place, allege so many witnesses as there are Catholics that I have conversed withal. They will, I am assured, all testify how carefully I have inculcated this commandment of His Holiness upon every occasion of speech; whereof I will infer that it is in no way probable, in never so prejudiced a judgment, that the author of this conspiracy durst acquaint me or any of mine with their purposes, knowing both this contrary commandment and the special account which above all other virtues we make of holy obedience; and I may very well say with St. Paul: *Si enim quæ destruxi, iterum hæc ædifico, prævaricatorem me constituo.*

"The fourth argument of my innocence shall not be so much a testimony as a challenge. Let the rack tortures, let the confessions of the conspirators, yea, let all our greatest adversaries utter what they can for my accusation, and yet I know my innocency in anything spoken or done ever since the first entrance of His Majesty's reign can never be blemished; and if at any point there may be the least doubt, I humbly beseech your honours to suspend your censures till I, knowing the exceptions against me, may with mine unfeigned integrity freely clear myself, to the satisfaction of all men of honour and wisdom.

"These former arguments being of that nature and power as may convince even the most wilful spirits either of too much malice or ignorance in their uncharitable surmises against us, yet let me, I beseech you, add some few more which are so probable that, in a moral matter as this is, they make a moral kind of certainty. It is not unknown what kind of affection and love we and all our Society have ever borne to His Majesty's royal person, parents and issue, and for mine own particular, how I behaved myself at his first entrance into this realm, and in the furtherance of peace with princes abroad, in which two points it may be better privately spoken than committed to paper, how well I have deserved in the conspiracy of Watson (my name and others being *falsely* used for to move divers confederates). By my special diligence, divers were delivered out of the trap. In Wales, though the matter was not such as was feared, yet I suppose my admonitions were not unfruitful. In this most horrible furnace, prepared for the best of the realm, besides the King's own person, the Queen and the two princes, there would have been included divers lords and ladies and others of special account, so highly honoured and affected by me, that I would rather have for everyone severally lost my life a thousand times than to have permitted their hazard. And, finally, that I may say nothing of the disgrace of our whole Society with foreign princes, if we had been faulty, these bloody matters or any other matters of war or State are so repugnant to priestly or religious profession, that we ought all to remember upon what occasion our Saviour said to His disciples: *Nescitis cujus spiritus estis*, and if we neglect this there want not censures of Holy Church and of our Society to testify, bridle and restrain us from the transgression of our duties in such degree. And as for six of them receiving at my hands, etc., I think I never saw six of them together in my life; and in such conspiracies never anything was heard of to be done publicly with kissing of the sacraments, or vowing, or such like, as ridiculously some imagine; so that in case any of them used any help in sacraments, I notwithstanding do truly say, in a like case with Achimelech: *Non scivi servus tuus quicquid super hoc negotium, nec modicum, nec grande.*

"This, my very good lords, amongst many things which I could allege for my innocency, I have briefly, but with all sincerity of unfeigned love to His Majesty, set down these few; and with the same sincerity and purity of mind I humbly offer to him all fidelity and loyalty, both for myself and all others who are under my charge, assuring him and also your lordships that we will in prayers, examples, actions, exhortations, and whatsoever labours he will impose upon us, seek with all our endeavour to preserve and increase the temporal and everlasting felicity of him and his royal Queen and issue. And thus I humbly take my leave, desiring Almighty God to bring us once more together, when we may incessantly praise the King of kings and live together for everlasting ages."

Whether this very characteristic letter ever reached the Council we know not. But while the bulk of the letter was strictly true, there were certain equivocal statements the true meaning of which the reader can supply from our narrative. It is a matter of conjecture what would have become of Garnett's protestations of loyalty to James had the Pope pronounced the same sentence as in the case of Elizabeth. Perhaps he would have been considered as no longer a lawful sovereign, and rebellion therefore could not then be aught else but legitimate warfare.

Humphrey Littleton, a neighbouring Catholic gentleman being then in trouble for having sheltered some of the conspirators, sent word to the Council that he had been recently at Hindlip (Mr. Abington's), where he heard Oldcorne preach. There he thought it most likely that Garnett would be found.

To take up Gerard's *Narrative*: "Upon this information

[1] The French ambassador, De la Boderie, however, was charged to express to James the Pope's abhorrence of the Gunpowder Plot: "The Pope abhors and condemns more severely than others the authors and accomplices of the said conspiracy, and if any Jesuits are convicted thereof they merit to be chastised like the rest. His Holiness only desired that a difference should be made between the innocent and the guilty and that the former should not suffer for the violent crimes of the latter" (*Ambassade de M. de la Boderie*, vol. i. p. 25). The papal representative in England, the Archpriest Blackwell, on 7th November and again on the 28th, issued a declaration of horror at the attempted crime; and protested: "For my own part (which is a duty common to us all) if any notice had been given to me, I should have been most forward, by all possible means, to have stayed and suppressed the same" (*Tierney*, vol. iv. p. cxii).

J. Rees Lugen. sculp.

Publish'd according to Act

SOUTH EAST *View of* HENLIP HOUSE.

was presently dispatched into the country to Sir Henry Bromley, a Knight, who was the nearest justice of account to Mr. Abington's house, and who was best experienced in searching of that house, which he had often performed before upon less likelihood of success than he now carried with him by means of this discovery and the extraordinary powers given him.[1] He came therefore to the house on a Sunday morning [19*th January*] very early, accompanied with above a hundred men, armed with guns and all kinds of weapons, more fit for an army than an orderly search. And beginning to beat at the gate with great importunity to be instantly let in, the Catholics within the house soon perceiving their intentions, made all the haste possible to hide both the priests and the Church stuff and books, and all such persons and things as belonged to the priests or might give cause of suspicion. In the meantime, sending to the gates, as the custom is, to know the cause of their coming, and to keep them in talk with messages to and fro, from the master and mistress of the house, all to gain time, whilst they within were hiding all things in the most safe places they had.

"But Sir Henry Bromley, impatient of this delay, caused the gates with great violence to be broken down, which yet he could not perform in so short a time (by reason they were very strong and answerable to the greatness of the house) before they within had made all safe which they would hide from this violent invasion. The Knight being entered by force, sent presently some principal persons with men enough to assist each of them into all the several parts of the house, as well as to take possession of the same, as to seize any persons that were suspicious, and to be sure that nothing should then be hidden after his entry. Himself showed to the mistress of the house (Mr. Abington himself being from home) his large commission to search, and the proclamation against those whom he would search. She yielded to this authority, and gave him full power to do his will. He began after the accustomed manner, to go through all the rooms of the house which were

[1] The Government seems to have taken extraordinary pains to secure Garnett. Levinus Munck, secretary to Cecil, sent Sir Henry Bromley special directions how to conduct the search. See Dom. Jac. I. vol. xviii. No. 29.

many and very large; he had with him Argus' eyes, man watchful and subtle companions, that would spy out the leas advantage or cause of suspicion; and yet they searched an sounded every corner in that great house till they were a weary, and found no likelihood of discovering that they cam for, though they continued the daily search, and that wit double diligence, all the whole week following. But upo Saturday, two laymen that did usually attend upon the tw priests, and were hid in a place by themselves, being almos starved to death, came out of their own accord.[1] For they ha placed the priests in another hiding-place, where there wa some provision of victuals laid up for their sustenance a fe days; but themselves were forced to go into a place upon th sudden, which, though it was safe from finding, yet had n provision at all to eat; and it is said they had but one appl between them in all those six or seven days. Whereupon the thought it best to come out; and yet not that so much to sav themselves from death by famine, as for that they perceive the resolution of the searchers to be of staying in the hous until they had either found or famished those whom they kne to be within. Therefore those two virtuous men, being i hope that upon their taking the searchers would be satisfie and depart (as either thinking them to be priests, or that there had been any more to be found they would also hav been forced to come out), this hope made them resolve to offe themselves to their enemies' hands, to save the lives of thos whom they loved better than themselves. And their comin out was in such manner as could endanger nothing but them selves; one of the two especially, whose name was Nichola Owen, abounding in discretion, which was the man that attende on Father Garnett."[2]

"They therefore, perceiving that some of the searchers di continually by turns watch and walk up and down the roo where they were hidden, which was a long gallery four-squa going round the house, watched their time when the searche

[1] This is not correct. It was on Thursday, 23rd January.

[2] Nicholas Owen, a Jesuit lay-brother, was the chief contriver of the secret hidin places which were made in the house where priests generally resided. Some of the remain to this day. The other was George Chambers, also a lay-brother.

were furthest off, and came out so secretly and quietly and shut the place again so finely, that they were not heard or perceived when or where they came out, and so they walked in the gallery towards the door which they thought belike to have found open. But the searchers being turned back in their walk, and perceiving two strange men to be there, whom they had not seen before, presently ran unto them and asked what they were. They answered they were men that were in the house, and would be content to depart if it pleased them. The others asked if they were priests; they answered they were Catholics, and that further they would not answer, being no doubt desirous to be taken for priests, the better to satisfy the insatiable mind of these bloodsuckers. Then being asked where they had been all the while, they answered they had hid themselves, being Catholics, to avoid taking. And being urged to tell or show the place where, they absolutely refused.

"But the searchers, knowing well that it must needs be in the gallery, began afresh to search more violently than ever, and to break down the wainscot with which it was lined, and the walls also in a number of places. And so they continued with all violence for five or six days after, and leaving no place untried, it pleased God to end the misery in which they kept those two good fathers by their so long and so straight inclosure, and to deliver them into their hands by permitting the searchers at last to light upon the very place itself. . . . The searchers therefore, having found and entered the secret place, they took the two fathers out of their close and painful prison, and seized upon such Church stuff and books as were also laid up in the same place, which made the room more straight and uneasy for them than otherwise it would have been."[1]

Father Oldcorne was recognised at once; but as to the other prisoners they were obliged to bring various persons to see whether he was Garnett himself. He was at last recognised by a priest, Anthony Sherlock. The arrest was effected

[1] A contemporary MS. states that "marmalade and other sweetmeats were found there lying by them: but that they had been chiefly supported by broths and warm drinks conveyed by a reed through a little hole that backed another chimney in a gentlewoman's chamber."

on or before 30th January, on which day news was sent to the Council. Meanwhile, Sir Henry Bromley took his prisoners to his own house, so as to have them carefully tended, and their strength restored before the long journey to London.

From a letter written 2nd March 1606 to his friend, Anne Vaux, "or any of our first, keep all discreetly secret,"[1] Garnett adds a few graphic particulars of his capture. They had been in the hole seven days and seven nights and some odd hours.[2] Their legs were so cramped that they became swollen. "When we came forth we appeared like two ghosts, yet I was the strongest, though my weakness lasted longest. The fellow that found us ran away for fear, thinking we would have shot a pistol at him; but there came needless company to assist him, and we bade them be quiet and we would come forth. So they helped us out very charitably, and we could not go but desired to be led to a house of office." By his testimony Sir Henry Bromley treated his prisoners well, taking them in his own coach to his house, where they "dined and supped with him and his every day." The ladies of the household were also very kind and attentive, and were with them so continuously that Sir Henry was afraid they would be perverted. "All the way up to London I was passing well used at the King's charge, and that by express order from Lord Salisbury. I had always the best horse in the company." Sir Henry, who accompanied his charges, writes from "Wickham this 5th of February 160$\frac{5}{6}$ late," and tells Salisbury he is obliged to come slowly, "for Mr. Garnett is but a weak and wearisome traveller, (*but*) to-morrow in the evening I trust to bring them up to London." The prisoners were confined in the Gatehouse.

Garnett had his first interview with the Council at Whitehall on the 14th, and was examined during three hours. There seems to have been on this occasion no reference made to the actual plot. But the subject of Equivocation came up. Garnett was known to hold the doctrine, and had had something to do with a treatise upon the subject. As we shall have to deal with this matter later on we pass it by for the moment.[3] The

[1] S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. xix. No. 11. [2] This must be a mistake.

[3] But we must here remark in Garnett's defence, that under the prevailing custom of forcing prisoners to bear witness against themselves under terrible tortu

power of the Pope to excommunicate the King was asked about; and Garnett allowed it in general, but seems to fence as regards the particular case of James. After this examination he was sent to the Tower, where he had "a very fine chamber." "I am allowed," he writes, "every meal a good draught of excellent claret wine; and I am liberal with myself and neighbours for good respects, to allow also of my own purse some sack."

Sir William Wade, the keeper, was, continues Garnett, "very kind in usage and familiarity, but most violent and impotent in speeches when he entereth into matters of religion. He saith all the Jesuits Orders shall be dissolved upon this, as the Templars; I said private faults do not prejudice the whole. But the Jesuits shall now [*be sent*] all out of England. I said that if it pleased the King to grant free liberty to other papists I would presently send away all Jesuits. My Lord Chief Justice said it was more than I could do. I said I would try. Indeed, I fear me some particular thing may be done this Parliament against Jesuits. My advice is that they hire themselves private lodgings and help their friends abroad, and I say they are dismissed for a time by their Superior. This think best till Father General's will be known."

Some more examinations ensued: but the Council failed in getting the evidence they wanted. Popham and Coke, the Lord Chief Justice and the Attorney-General, offered, says Gerard, "if they might have full scope to deal with him as they thought good they would undertake to prove him guilty of the Plot of Powder." After several examinations they gave out that he had confessed all.[1] This was false; but it was a Government device meant to secure the passing of an Act condemning certain Jesuits for treason in this matter. When

Equivocation became an almost necessary weapon of defence. If force cannot be met with force, and if might uses its power to crush right, methods will surely be found by the weak to escape the tyranny. Hence if Garnett be considered blameworthy for his use of Equivocation, much more so were the tyrannical Government, who, without the sanction of the English law, were accustomed to torture with the purpose of making a prisoner incriminate himself.

[1] Anne Vaux says she was sorry to hear that Father Garnett was privy to the plot, as he made many protestations to the contrary. S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. xix. No. 35.

Parliament demanded the proofs, Gerard says, Coke had none to give save "conjectures, imaginations, and inferences of his own." The ruse did not succeed. "Yea, a nobleman coming from the Parliament at that time said to his friend that these lawyers were so accustomed to lie that they could say truth in no place." Foiled in this, Popham and Coke used stratagems which were more successful. They got, by means of the keeper, a "fellow so cunning in this art of cozenage," an avowal sufficient for their purposes. The keeper pretended to be a friend to Garnett, and undertook to deliver letters to his friends. These letters are now in the Record Office. Garnett, to avoid suspicion, writes the important part in orange juice, a device easily to be found out by any ordinary intelligence. These letters were kept, and forgeries (forgery was then a high art and in great requisition with the admirers of "state-craft") were sent to the correspondents, who duly replied. There were in these letters certain expressions such as: "he was so clear of the Powder that the same could not be proved against him." This was not quite enough, but it encouraged his hunters to try another means of entrapping him. "To this end they placed Fr. Oldcorne in a chamber near to Fr. Garnett; and one time this sly companion and cunning or rather cozening keeper, making show of great love to Fr. Garnett, told him there was a thing wherein he knew the Father would take great comfort and which he would be willing to grant (as desiring to do him any service), but that he durst never as yet tell him of it, lest it should be espied by others, and then he was undone. And this was, forsooth, that he might at some convenient times come to speak with Fr. Oldcorne, and that he would willingly grant them both this favour, so that Fr. Garnett would promise never to disclose it, and give the like charge unto Fr. Oldcorne. This being promised, the fellow showed Fr. Garnett the way unto the wall of Fr. Oldcorne's chamber, wherein there was a cleft by which they might well speak together, and hear one the other, if they did speak of any loudness. This was accepted by both the Fathers as a great courtesy; as indeed it is no small comfort in such a place to men of their quality, if this honey had not been stuffed with too much gall. But this

dogged fellow dogged them so closely as they could never meet but he would be of the council, though unseen by them; for the place was purposely so contrived as that the sound of their words must needs be carried to another place not far off where this keeper would stand and some other with him,[1] to have a double witness in their double dealing. Whereupon it happened not long after that these two Fathers, thinking themselves secure in this point, took some fit time (as they thought) to have each other's help in the Sacrament of Confession. And after they had ended their spiritual business, they began to confer of each other's estate, demanding what had been asked and what answered in the times of their examinations. Amongst other things Fr. Oldcorne demanding of Fr. Garnett whether Mr. Winter's going into Spain and his negotiations there were not laid to his charge, to this the Father answered: 'He could answer that well enough, for after that time he had the King's general pardon at the time of his coming to the Crown, that other business with Spain being in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.'[2] Then Fr. Oldcorne also demanded whether he was not pressed with this matter of the Powder Treason, as being a likely thing they would urge that above all other matters against him. Fr. Garnett answered that 'so they did; but that they could prove no such matter against him, and that no man living could touch him in that matter, but one.' This, lo, was the word that afterwards bred him so much trouble, and others of his friends so much grief, until by his public answers he had cleared their doubts, and by his death put the matter out of doubt, that he was not to be charged with any crime in the matter of that treason."

But the news was carried at once to the Council, and a day was appointed for further examination by Salisbury, Suffolk, Northampton, and others. "When he was brought before the Lords, he was in a very strange plight, so thirsty as not able to spit or speak; beer was called for, and he drank two glasses before them; withal he was so drowsy as not able to hold up

[1] Lockerson, private secretary to Cecil, and Fassett, a magistrate attached to the Tower, were the eavesdroppers.

[2] This avowal of treason is quietly omitted by Foley, who, although professing to quote Gerard, gives no signs of omission. (*Records*, vol. iv. p. 93.)

his head; he complaining that he had not slept in five nights before." It was said he had been kept from sleep, and drugged; but as "Fr. Garnett being asked the question in public, did not take knowledge of any extraordinary hard usage in these kinds, I (*Gerard*) for my part do rather think it was done, but in such manner as himself could not perceive, by mixing his meat or drink with such confections as might work both those effects to distemper his body and hinder his sleep, and yet the father not know when or how it was procured."

Being thus so heavy in his head and not fit to be examined he was allowed to sleep for an hour (this does away with Gerard's surmise that he had been drugged), and then was straightly examined upon the plot. But denying that there was anyone who could accuse him therein, he was taken to the torture room. Whether he was actually tortured or not does not quite appear, except by mere hearsay. However, in sight of the rack, he was told that he had been overheard telling Oldcorne that there was one man who could accuse him. Seeing then that he was convicted out of his own mouth, he acknowledged "the matter justly, that being the time wherein he might lawfully do it, and before he could not: the knowledge that he had, being a secret committed to him in confession, which the penitent did only license him to utter to save himself from torture, but not in any other case." He was taken back to the Lords, who questioned him eagerly. Garnett testified that it was from Greenway that he got the details. Whether one can follow Gerard in his exoneration of Garnett for thus giving away Greenway, is perhaps doubtful. It will be noticed that Garnett only admits what he knew there was no good in denying. His knowledge of Catesby's projects had not yet been urged against him.[1]

The news soon got abroad, and it was the common talk that the Jesuits were the chief authors and contrivers of the plot. The news was given to the various ambassadors, that they might communicate it to their respective Courts. How the poor Catholics of England were troubled at the report, which of course got exaggerated as it spread, can easily be imagined.

The case was sent for trial; and the day appointed was

[1] It was on 12th March that, under examination, he confessed that Catesby had acquainted him in general with a project he had in hand.

Friday, 28th March. Early in the morning, before nine o'clock, he was brought in a coach, with blinds drawn, to the Guildhall, where the Royal Commissioners together with the Lord Mayor were awaiting him. The King watched the trial from a secret place. Popham presided and Coke prosecuted. From a manuscript in the British Museum [1] as well as from the State Trials [2] we get details of the trial. The charge made against him was "that on the month of June last past in the parish of St. Michael's in the ward of Queenhithe, London, he had conspired with Robert Catesby (lately slain in open rebellion against His Majesty) the death of our Sovereign Lord the King and his son, a prince of great expectation, etc." Here it is clear that the charge upon which Garnett was indicted did not include the knowledge he received from Greenway in the confessional. James, to his honour, refused to allow it to be used against the prisoner in the indictment, although the matter came up at the trial. It is not necessary for us to go into all the details of the trial. We have already the facts before us. After the speech of the Attorney-General, who made a strong point in the fact that Garnett might have commanded Greenway to have desisted, but did not, and allowed him when the plot was discovered to go into the country to stir up rebellion, *qui non prohibet quod prohibere potest consentire videtur*, Garnett made his reply, and touched on four principal charges: the doctrine of Equivocation and the deposing of kings; the behaviour of the recusants; the Jesuits as plotters in the matter of Collyn, Yorke, Williams, and Squires, an unlikely thing, as these men were Protestants.

And as regards himself, he protested that he was clear from approving of this or any other treasonable attempts. Adding: "Albeit I must confess I did understand in general by Mr. Catesby long since that he would have attempted something for the good of Catholics, which I dissuaded him from so effectually that I had thought he would utterly desist from such treasonable pretences, and this I revealed not, because that as a religious priest I thought to suppress it between him and me, which course our Saviour prescribeth, warning us that if our brother offend in anything we should admonish him

[1] Add. MS. 21203, *Plut.* ciii. F.

[2] Vol. ii. pp. 218–258.

between ourselves . . . Now, my Lords, because I am persuaded that upon this admonition he would give over his former design, I deemed myself in conscience discharged from making any further discovery or overture of that practice, howbeit that in your common law I think it insufficient, in regard it deemeth it inconvenient to leave the safety of the Commonwealth depending on the discretion and peculiar provision of some private man, etc."[1]

After a long trial, lasting till night-fall, the jury brought in a verdict of Guilty. The point really before the jury was whether Garnett was guilty of misprision of treason by concealing; or of high treason by approval, assistance, and encouragement. They brought in the verdict of high treason. About the truth of the first charge there could be no doubt; and as to the other, Mr. Jardine says: "It is impossible to point out a single ascertained fact either declared by him in his examination by the Commissioners or to the jury on his trial, or revealed by him afterwards, or urged by his apologists since his death, which is inconsistent with his criminal implication in the plot. On the other hand, all the established and undisputed facts of the transaction are consistent with his being a willing, consenting, and approving confederate, and many of them are wholly unaccounted for by any other supposition."[2]

Those who are not inclined to accept the verdict of Mr. Jardine must at least allow that Garnett was singularly unfortunate in all his actions, and that he did not take the ordinary means of preventing the plot. He knew by a general knowledge that Catesby was engaged in some treason; he also knew (putting aside altogether what Greenway told him in secrecy) that one of his own subjects was acquainted with details. If, instead of allowing him to continue his intercourse with the conspirators, Garnett had exercised his authority and sent him at once out of the country, something might have been said for the plea that he did not encourage the plot. He did nothing, however, of the kind. But quite apart from

[1] Among other reasons he urges: "And lastly, in that I knew them (*such practices*) contrary to our obedience which we make most account of, which expressly forbid us to meddle in such causes." But as Parsons had acted in the teeth of the same prohibition, it is not to be wondered at that Garnett imitated him.

[2] P. 321.

Greenway's communication, Garnett had sufficient knowledge, and it was his obvious duty, both as a Catholic and as an Englishman, to have informed the Government. The sentence of the jury, from the mere facts of the case, was therefore perfectly justified, on the grounds that he who can prevent and does not prevent an action is supposed to approve of it. History has confirmed their verdict.

After the trial he was taken back to the Tower, where he remained in close custody till his execution. Every effort seems to have been used to make him recant; for the general opinion appears to have been very properly expressed by Coke in his speech in the Guildhall, when he said that Garnett was "a man, grave, discreet, wise, learned, and of excellent ornament both of nature and art, and one that, if he will, may do His Majesty as much good service as any subject I know of in England."

Soon after his condemnation Garnett wrote to Anne Vaux (3rd April), and in the course of his letter he says about the knowledge he received from Catesby:

"... it may be Catholics also think strange we should be acquainted with such things; but who can hinder but he must know things sometimes which he would not. I never allowed it; I sought to hinder it more than men can imagine, as the Pope will tell. It was not my part (as I thought) to disclose it. I have written this day a detestation of that action for the King to see. And I acknowledge myself not to die a victorious martyr, but as a penitent thief, as I hope I shall do. And so will I say at the execution, whatsoever others have said or held before."[1]

In his declaration (4th April) to the King[2] Garnett makes the following important avowal: "Also I acknowledge that I was bound to reveal all knowledge that I had of this or any other treason out of the Sacrament of Confession. And whereas, partly upon hope of prevention, partly for that I would not betray my friend, I did not reveal the general knowledge of Mr. Catesby's intention which I had by him. I do acknowledge myself highly guilty and to have offended God, the King's Majesty and estate, and humbly ask of all forgiveness, etc." This is a clear admission of guilt, legal and moral.

[1] Dom. Jac. I. vol. xx. No. 11. [2] *Ibid.* No. 12.

The following letter is most important; it was written to Greenway on the day after the above declaration:

"I wrote yesterday a letter to the King, in which I avowed, as I do now, that I always condemned that intention of the Powder Plot; and I admitted that I might have revealed the general knowledge I had of it from Catesby out of confession, and should have done so if I had not relied upon the Pope's interference to prevent their design, and had not been unwilling to betray my friend; and in this I confessed I had sinned both against God and the King, and prayed for pardon from both."[1]

He also wrote in the same strain to his brethren the Jesuits in England. The letter to Greenway was intercepted. When examined before the Commissioners (25th April), Garnett affirmed, "upon his priesthood, that he did never write any letter or letters, nor send any message to Greenway since he was at Coughton; and this he protested to be spoken without equivocation."[2] But when, a few days afterwards (28th April), he was confronted with his letter, and asked how he could justify such a falsehood, he replied: "That he had done nothing but that he might lawfully do, and that it was evil done of the Lords to ask that question of him, and to urge him upon his priesthood, when they had his letters which he had written, for he never would have denied them if he had seen them; but supposing the Lords had not his letters, he did deny in such sort as he did the writings of any letter, which he might lawfully do."[3] Had Garnett followed the example of Him of whose Society he claimed to be, and kept silence, it would have been better for his good name and fame. As it is, we are forced to conclude that no reliance can be put upon any word he says, unless it be supported by other evidence.

During this period of detention Garnett was closely questioned on the subject of Truth. There seems to have been some kind of desire on the part of the King not to proceed to extremities; but Garnett's avowals on the subject of Equivocation practically settled his fate; for it was found obviously impossible to believe a word he said. Lingard, the Catholic historian, says: "To these and similar avowals I ascribe his

[1] Abbott's *Antilogia*, p. 147.

[2] S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. xx. No. 44.

[3] *Ibid.* No. 48.

execution. By seeking shelter under Equivocation he had deprived himself of the protection which the truth might have afforded him; nor could he in such circumstances reasonably complain if the King refused credit to his asseverations of innocence, and permitted the law to take its course."[1]

Garnett's state of mind is one that deserves commiseration. As he said, he was *in medio illusorum*. An advantage was taken of the report that great scandal had been taken by Catholics at his trial, and he was told that five hundred of them had turned Protestants; "which," he writes to Anne Vaux (3rd April), "if it should be true I must needs think that many other Catholics are scandalised at me also. I desire all to judge me in charity, for I thank God most humbly in all speeches and actions I have had a desire to do nothing against the glory of God. . . . Let anybody consider if they had been twenty-three times examined before the wisest of the realm, besides particular conferences with Master Lieutenant, what they could have done upon so many evidences, for the conspirators thought themselves sure and used my name freely, though I protest none of them ever told me of anything."[2] We can well understand Garnett's passionate exclamation to the Earl of Salisbury, "My lord, I would to God I had never known of the Powder Treason."[3]

A few days before his execution several Anglican divines visited him in the Tower. Among them were Dr. James Montague, Dean of the Chapel Royal and afterwards Bishop of Winchester; Dr. Neill, Dean of Westminster; and Dr. Overall, Dean of St. Paul's. One of the visitors asked Garnett, "Whether he was concerned that the Church of Rome after his death would declare him a martyr; and whether, as a matter of opinion and doctrine, he thought the Church would be right in doing so, and that he should in that case really become a true martyr? Upon this Garnett exclaimed with a deep sigh, 'I a martyr? Oh what a martyr should I be! God forbid! If, indeed, I were really about to suffer death for the sake of the Catholic religion, and if I had never known of this project except by means of sacramental confession, I might perhaps be accounted

[1] *History of England*, vii. p. 81. [2] S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. xx. No. 11.
[3] *State Trials*, ii. p. 256.

worthy of the honour of martyrdom, and might deservedly be glorified in the opinion of the Church; as it is, I acknowledge myself I have sinned in this respect, and deny not the justice of the sentence passed on me.' 'Would to God,' he added, 'that I could recall that which has been done! Would to God that anything had happened rather than that this stain of treason should attach to my name! I know that my offence is most grievous, though I have confidence in Christ to pardon me on my hearty penitence; but I would give the whole world, if I possessed it, to be able to die without the weight of this sin upon my soul.'"[1]

The date originally fixed for his execution was 1st May. He begged that he might not be made a "May-game"; so the Council changed the date to Saturday, the 3rd of May. When the day came, as Garnett was being led out from his cell, he said to one of the cooks who bade him good-bye: "Farewell, good friend, Tom; this day I will save thee a labour to provide my dinner." And, going a little farther towards the hurdle, there met them also the Lieutenant's wife to take her leave, who said: "God be with you and comfort you, good Mr. Garnett; I will pray for you"; to whom with a joyful countenance he gave thanks, saying: "I thank you, good madam, and for your prayers, you may keep them at this time; and if it pleaseth God to give me perseverance, I will not forget you in my prayers."[2] He had in that supreme hour regained all his strength of mind, and faced death with calmness. The hurdle awaited him, and thereon he was laid, "as the order is, having a black cloak somewhat long upon his other clothes and a hat on his head." Dragged by three horses, he was carried out to his doom. During the last journey "he held his hands together, lifted up somewhat towards heaven, and kept his eyes shut for the most part, as a man in deep contemplation." So says Gerard.

The scaffold had been erected at the west end of St. Paul's Churchyard, hard by the bishop's house. The neighbourhood

[1] Quoted in Jardine, p. 251. Casaubon is the authority, and he gives as his source the three deans. There is nothing in this letter out of keeping with Garnett's admission to Anne Vaux that he was dying as a penitent thief, not as a glorious martyr. See also *Antilogia*, p. 148.

[2] Gerard's *Narrative*.

was thronged with a crowd anxious to see how the Jesuit Superior comported himself. Windows filled with people, and standing-places sold for large sums, showed how excited were the people. Arrived at the scaffold, the deans of St. Paul's and Westminster met him, and the former, with hat in hand, said: "Mr. Garnett, I am sent unto you from His Majesty to will you that now being in the last hour of your mortal life, you will perform the duty of a true subject, to whom you are obliged by the laws of God and nature; and therefore to disclose such treasons as you know intended towards His Majesty's danger and the Commonwealth." To which Garnett answered, "Mr. Dean, it may please you to tell His Majesty that I have been arraigned, and what could be laid to my charge I have there answered and said as much as I could, so that in this place I have no more to say." To their religious exhortations he would not listen. When asked by the Recorder to acknowledge he was justly condemned, in spite of his declaration to the King to that effect, he is reported to have answered, "He had not committed any treason or offence against His Majesty, nor even guilty of the Powder Treason in the least degree . . . neither could they condemn him for anything but for not opening the secret of confession in which only he had knowledge of the treason." So says Gerard, who was not present; but such language in face of Garnett's own avowal, his letter to Anne Vaux, and the very terms of the indictment itself, forces one to conclude that Gerard is here, as elsewhere, no very trustworthy recorder of events, his main object being to prove Garnett absolutely innocent and a martyr. We would fain believe that Garnett preserved to the last the dispositions in which he acknowledged himself "highly guilty," and dying, not "as a victorious martyr, but as a penitent thief." These were the better dispositions in which to approach the all-knowing Judge. One of his last words was to defend the honour of his friend, Anne Vaux, as "a perfect pure virgin, if (*as?*) any other in England or otherwise"; this was in answer to a ribald inquiry from one of the crowd. Then making his last prayer, and stripping to his shirt, he said he ever meant to die a true and perfect Catholic. With pious ejaculations on his lips, and crossing his arms over his breast he gave the

signal to the hangman, and was cast off the ladder. Without a struggle, he hanged till he was dead; nor would the people, who were much moved by his gentle behaviour, allow the executioner to cut him down until he was quite dead. The rest of the sentence was carried out. Drawn and quartered, his head was set up on London Bridge. So died Henry Garnett in his fifty-first year and the eighteenth as Superior of the Jesuits in England.

Connected with his death is the so-called prodigy of the famous Straw. The best and most reliable account is the following document, which is preserved in the archives of the old English Chapter:

"The Confession of Hugh Griffin of St. Clements's without Temple Bar, tailor, taken by the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, the 27th of November 1606. He saith that the same day that Garnett was executed, one John Wilks, a silkman, being come out of his prenticeship two years since, and living now amongst his friends in Yorkshire, brought to this examinate's house a straw, with an ear upon it, which he said was one of the straws whereupon Garnett was laid when he was executed: that the straw and ear were bloody: and this examinate and his wife desired to have the straw: that he promised they should have it at his going into the country: that they advised with the said Wilks to have the straw put into a crystal for the better preserving of it: that within three or four days or a week (as he remembereth) the straw was set in crystal according to the former resolution: that about nine weeks since, and not before, he, this examinate, looking earnestly through the crystal upon the said straw, with his wife and one Thomas (who once served, as he thinketh, the Lady Beeston, wife to Sir Hugh Beeston), they all together at once discovered a thing like a face upon the ear of the said straw: that this examinate did first say to the other two (as he thinketh), 'Do you not discern a thing upon the ear like a face?' And they answered that they did: that thereupon he then (as he thinketh) opened the crystal, and then upon their earnest looking upon it, they imagined they saw a face: that this examinate thereupon said to the rest, 'This may chance to proceed from our fancies' and therefore desired them to make no words of it until it

were better decided: that he kept it in his house about a fortnight, and in the meanwhile looked upon it forty times (as he thinketh), and sometimes half an hour or an hour together, until he saw the visage so perfectly, as he is sure he could not be deceived: that the face is so perfectly apparent, being once found, namely, the forehead, the eyes, the cheek, the nose, the mouth, the beard and the neck, as he supposeth no man living is able to draw the like thing upon the like subject: that the said Wilks, when he left the straw in the crystal with this examinate did not (as he thinketh) ever imagine that there was any face upon it: that he doth not remember that any but himself and his wife did see the said face during the said fortnight, or that himself did acquaint any with it: that peradventure his wife might tell somebody of it, but whom he knoweth not . . . that if any affirm that there is any light or beams about the said face, he affirmeth that which is not true: that for aught this examinate knoweth, the said face is no more like Garnett's face than any other man's hath a beard: that he imagineth the face being so little, no man is able to say it is like Garnett: that this examinate did never see Mr. Garnett but when he was brought to the Tower, etc."

This is the first-hand report of the famous straw. Griffin at first thought there was "a thing upon the ear like a face." Then after a close examination for two weeks, "sometimes half an hour or an hour together," he sees the face perfectly. As the straw itself has disappeared, we must content ourselves with the picture given in Foley's *Records*.[1] A close examination gives us the following result. There are *two* faces, one upon the other; only the lower one shows anything that might be taken for a forked beard. The upper face is strikingly distinct; but, with the very best intention in the world, we can discern absolutely no likeness to Fr. Garnett, supposing that the portrait at the beginning of the volume is a correct likeness. It appears from the examination of Griffin that he gave the crystal to Wilks, who inserted the straw and had it framed. What might have passed during this time while it was back again in Wilks' possession, we do not know. "He

[1] iv. p. 133.

had gone beyond the seas"; and we have no means of examining him. Nor is there any examination of Griffin's wife, as to whose powers of keeping a secret "this examinate" won't commit himself. The story lost nothing in repetition, and the marvel became greater. Fr. Blount writing (8th November 1606), says it was "so lively representing Mr. Garnett, as not only in my eyes, but in the eyes of others which knew him, it doth lively represent him"; and in another letter (March 1607): "It cannot be a thing natural or artificial. The sprinkling of blood hath made so plain a face, so well proportioned, so lively shadowed, as no art in such a manner is able to counterfeit the like." There seems to be no reference to the double face as represented in the picture. Of its subsequent history little is known. Taken at first to Spain, to Andera, it found its way to the English Jesuits' college at Liège, but appears to have been lost shortly after the suppression of the Society.

Fr. Oldcorne preceded Garnett to his fate. He remained at Worcester, where he was tried on the following counts: that he had harboured Garnett, a denounced traitor; he had written to Fr. Jones in Herefordshire to aid in hiding two of the conspirators, Robert Winter and Stephen Littleton; and he had approved of the plot as a good action, although it failed in its effect. As to the third count, Oldcorne confessed (12th March 1606)[1] that he had said to Humphry Littleton (who began to think he had done wrong, inasmuch as the plot had failed) "that an act is not to be condemned or justified upon the good or bad event that followeth it, but upon the end or object and the means that is used for effecting the same. . . . And then I applied it to this fact of Mr. Catesby's: it is not to be approved or condemned by the event, but by the proper object or end and means which was to be used in it; and because I know nothing of these I will neither approve it or condemn it, but leave it to God and their own consciences, and in this wary way I spoke to him, because I doubted he came to entrap."

Oldcorne was executed on 7th April, with Ralph Ashley and Mr. Abington. It is somewhat satisfactory to learn that

[1] Dom. Jac. I. vol. xix. No. 35.

Humphry Littleton, who had betrayed them, was executed at the same time.

Of Brother Nicholas Owen we learn that he died on the rack in the Tower; and it was given out that he had committed suicide. But of this there seems no reliable evidence.

We can now compare Garnett's character with that given him by Foley on More.[1] It does not seem to have been remarkable for prudence or candour. Simplicity, in one sense, it certainly had. As regards candour we are obliged to take up the oft-disputed subject of Equivocation, which is so bound up with his name.[2] As he held certain views on the subject, his enemies, and perhaps not without reason, complained that no value was to be attached to any statement he made. An examination of his replies and declarations will convince the reader that the statements were those of a man who was fencing for his life, and who, until an accusation was proved beyond contention, would deny any charge. His weapon was Equivocation. Whether the whole case of Garnett's prosecution does not throw a light upon a certain question of to-day, which seeks to break the silence the English law so wisely imposes upon the accused, is a matter worth consideration.

There were in those days certain theologians who held views on the subject of truth which were highly dangerous to common morality. Lessius, for instance, was one of the Jesuit theologians who held them, and his opinions were eventually condemned by the Pope. As regards Garnett, the

[1] See p. 161, *ante*.

[2] Shakespear, who often refers in his plays to current events, seems to allude in *Macbeth* (Act II. Scene ii.) to what was the *cause célèbre* of the day:

"Here's a knocking, indeed! If a man were porter of hell-gate he should have old turning the key. [*Knocking.*] Knock, knock, knock! Who's there, in the name of Beelzebub? Here's a *farmer* that hanged himself on the expectation of plenty. . . . 'Faith, here's an equivocator, that could swear in both the scales against either side: who committed treason enough for God's sake, yet could not equivocate to heaven, etc."

Garnett's *alias* of Farmer was well known; and his teaching on Equivocation was town-talk. Such a bit of topical "gag" would have been thoroughly well understood by an audience of the year 1606. The speech of the porter seems also to settle the disputed date of the play, which is generally put between 1606 and 1610. In the former year Garnett's trial would have been on everyone's lips; at a later date the allusion would have lost its piquancy. There is also evidence to show that the poet, if he had leanings towards Catholicism, was not friendly to the Jesuit party.

verdict of historians has been unanimous in condemning him. "He avowed principles as inconsistent with all good government as they were contrary to sound morality," says Mr. Jardine.[1] Dr. Gardiner, always so fair-minded, does not hesitate to say: "The Jesuitical doctrine on the subject of truth and falsehood which he openly professed was enough to ruin any man."[2] Lingard's opinion we have already given.

While reminding the reader that the state of the law in those days made Equivocation an almost necessary result of torture, there is perhaps no need to point out that this doctrine, even if debatable in speculative schools of theology, is full of danger when brought to practice. We see a case in illustration in Parsons, who, sheltering himself under the doctrine, does not hesitate under stress of controversy to suppress what he knew was true, and thus suggest what he knew was false. For together with Equivocation goes Mental Reservation.

It must be, however, remembered that the doctrine of Equivocation was no invention of Garnett's. Some of the theologians of the Society had indeed been great advocates of the theory, and they were only carrying out principles that other theologians had advanced. As far back as April 1597 Garnett seems to have committed himself to the doctrine; for then, so he tells Parsons, he had the idea of publishing a work on the subject to explain a point "much wondered at by Catholics and heretics." According to him, such a doctrine was a novelty to the Catholics of England, who "wondered" at it. Fr. Southwell, as we have seen, openly maintained in 1595 the lawfulness of what he called "Equivocation." It is possible to say that he went perhaps further than Garnett, and it was to do away with the surprise his conduct gave that the Superior proposed to write his work.

What, then, in plain simple English is this doctrine? First, it is laid down by the theologians who write on the subject that a lie is a sin; secondly, "a person under examination may, in certain contingencies, righteously dissemble or deny his knowledge, but only when he is explicitly conscious of a good and sufficient reason absolving him from the obligation of giving right information." Or, to put it in the more forcible

[1] *Criminal Trials*, vol. ii. p. 315. [2] *History of England*, vol. i. p. 280.

language of a writer in *The Month*:[1] "It was neither more nor less than . . . 'downright lying,' inasmuch as it consisted in a flat denial of what was in fact the truth; but with this essential proviso: that a man must never tell a falsehood 'knowing it to be such,' that is to say, must never admit what he feels to be a violation of the moral law. He may never contradict in words what he knows to be the actual truth, unless he has manifest assurance that he is right in doing so, and that accordingly, in speaking as he does, he tells no lie." We give the above as the defence made to-day by one of Garnett's successors. The ordinary reader, who is not trained in the subtleties of the schools, may ask: If we apply this same reasoning to all the commandments, *e.g.* "Thou shalt not commit adultery," what becomes of the Moral Law?

Instead of writing the proposed book, Garnett corrected a treatise on the subject supposed to have been written by Francis Tresham; and altered the title from *A Treatise of Equivocation* to *A Treatise against Lying and Fraudulent Dissimulation*.[2] This book became the object of much inquiry during his examinations. In his trial Garnett says: "We teach not that Equivocation may be used promiscuously, and that at our own pleasure in matters of contract, in matters of testimony or before a competent judge, or to the prejudice of any third person, in which case we judge it to be altogether unlawful. But only we think it lawful when they are no way prejudicial to others, for our own, our brother's good, or when we are pressed to questions that are harmful to ourselves or others to answer, or urged upon examination to answer to one whom we do not hold to be a competent judge or would force us to open matters not liable to his court."

Holding, as the Jesuits did, the "high" doctrines on the Pope's rights over princes, we think that there may be a great deal in the phrase "a competent judge." If James' right to rule did not come from the Pope, might not the competency of his judges be questioned? A distinction is easily drawn between *de jure* and *de facto* when it is to one's advantage.

[1] *The Month*, July 1898. This seems to be wider than the conventional "not guilty," which ceases to be Equivocation from the very fact of its conventionality.

[2] It was printed in 1851 by Mr. Jardine.

In a paper written the day after his trial upon this same subject, Garnett says: "Neither is Equivocation at all to be justified but in case of necessary defence from injustice or wrong or of the obtaining some good of great importance when there is no danger of harm to others. . . ." And he makes the following admission: "For this is a general rule —that in cases of true and manifest treason a man is bound voluntarily to utter the very truth and in no way to equivocate, if he knew it not by way of confession, in which case also he is bound to seek all lawful ways to discover *salvo sigillo*."[1] In applying this last admission to Garnett's knowledge of the plot, we can understand his avowal that his sentence was just; for he had certainly not voluntarily uttered the very truth of what he knew in general was "true and manifest treason."

This being Garnett's theory, it remains to be seen how he put it into practice. There are three instances to the point. He denied having been at certain houses; he denied having held conversations with Oldcorne; he denied having written a certain letter to Greenway. He protested on his salvation and priesthood that what he said was true. But when it was proved that he was at these particular houses, that he had been overheard conversing with Oldcorne, who under torture acknowledged it, and that his letter to Greenway was in the hands of the Government, he could only say in self-defence: "That he might lawfully deny it in such sort as he did till they were able to prove it . . . for no man is bound to charge himself till he is convicted." After these cases, who is to blame those who felt they could not put reliance upon any word he said?[2]

[1] Dom. Jac. I. vol. xix. No. 95.

[2] As to the general matter of Equivocation, the bulk of English readers will agree with Newman who, after saying, "Casuistry is a noble science, but it is one to which I am led neither by my abilities nor by my turn of mind," goes on to the point . . . "Thirdly, as to playing upon words, or Equivocation, I suppose it is from the English habit, but without meaning any disrespect to a great saint (Alphonso de Liguori), or wishing to set myself up, or taking my conscience for more than it is worth, I can only say as a fact, that I admit it as little as the rest of my countrymen: and that without any reference to the right or wrong of the matter, of this I am sure, that there is one thing more than another which prejudices Englishmen against the Catholic Church, it is the doctrine of great authorities on the subject. For myself, I can fancy myself thinking it was allowable in extreme cases for me to lie, but never to equivocate. Luther said, 'Pecca fortiter.' I anathematise his formal sentiment

Charges have been made against Garnett upon the subject of sobriety and of his relation with Anne Vaux. It seems that reports adverse to him had gone to Rome. Griffith Floyd says under examination that he was sent by Parsons into England after the Powder Treason to know whether Garnett was privy to it otherwise than in confession; whether he was as delicate in diet and as familiar with Mrs. Anne Vaux as reported.[1]

This Anne Vaux and her sister, Mrs. Brookesby, were daughters of William, third Lord Vaux of Harrowden. Both were friends and penitents of Garnett's, and were seconders in all things, their purse being always at his disposal. Anne especially seems to have been on terms of great intimacy with the Jesuits, and signs herself "Yours and not my own." She was under vow of obedience to Garnett, who wrote to her from the Tower a letter in secret ink, which was deciphered:

"Concerning the disposing of yourself, I give you leave to go over to them;[2] the vow of obedience ceaseth, being made to the superiors of this mission. You may upon deliberation make it to some there.

"If you like to stay here, then I exempt you till a superior be appointed whom you may acquaint, but tell him that you made your vow of yourself and then told me, and that I limited certain conditions, as that you are not bound under sin except you be commanded *in virtute obedientiæ*; we may accept no vows. But men may make them as they list, and we after give directions accordingly."[3]

Their connection was a purely religious one. That she valued and loved Garnett as a spiritual father (and he seems to have been a very lovable man to his own people), that she had unbounded confidence in his judgment and was devoted to his service, may well be without the slightest approach to

ut there is a truth in it when spoken of material acts" (*Apologia pro vita sua* (ed. 890), p. 360).

[1] Dom. Jac. I. vol. lxxxi. No. 70. Floyd was a Jesuit from 1593 till 1612, when he eft the Society, as he says, "because they attended more to politics than religion" *Ibid.* No. 59).

[2] Anne Vaux wanted to go to Belgium, but she remained in England and opened er house as a school under the Jesuits.

[3] Dom. Jac. I. vol. xx. No. 11.

immorality. Garnett's ideal was too high and too noble for us to entertain the calumnies which came from the lowest of his enemies. But, on the other hand, it says little for his discretion, considering the times and circumstances, to have allowed any women, however pious they were, to be on such familiar terms with him and his fellow-Jesuits. That intense love of being directed, even in minute things, which too often characterises "the devout female sex," is fraught with danger to both director and directed, because it tends to destroy that equilibrium of responsibility which is so necessary for a healthy spiritual tone.

To sum up the question of the Jesuits and the Gunpowder Plot. That they were the instigators of it, there is no evidence: but that they had been mixed up before in treasonable practices with some of these very conspirators, is certain. That dangerous answers were given to questions, put purposely in general, is also evident. That it was the Jesuits, alone of the missionary body, who were in anyway connected with the plot, is also admitted: that they were so is to be attributed to a certain itching to have a hand in what was going on and to "direct" affairs. That they had the reputation of dabbling in politics and suffered in consequence, is apparent to every one. That Garnett was tried upon the general knowledge he had from Catesby, and upon this alone was condemned, is clear to the reader: therefore, in no sense of the word is he a martyr for his religion nor a martyr for the seal of confession.[1] This last conclusion seems to be that of the authorities at Rome in 1886. When considering the claims for beatification of certain sufferers for conscience' sake the case of Henry Garnett and others concerned with the Plot was put aside, or at any rate delayed for further evidence. This decision of Rome seems to be in accordance with the general verdict of history.

In concluding this subject, the reader may ask, What was

[1] Foley, without attending to the decree of Urban VIII., calls him a "martyr," and says: "He is justly regarded as a martyr to the sacredness of the seal of the Sacrament of Confession" (vol. vii. p. 288). Passing by the inaccuracy of speaking of "the Sacrament of Confession," Foley, though he prints the account of the trial as given in the British Museum Additional MS., failed to see that Garnett was neither indicted nor condemned upon any knowledge he had from the confessional.

ne attitute of Parsons? We can only say there seems to be n absence of documentary evidence about a period which is eculiarly interesting. Garnett, we hear, burnt the letters he eceived, and one may conclude that his successor followed hat example. As far as I know, the only available means ve have of judging the opinions of Parsons on this matter are few references to the Gunpowder Plot in his book, "The udgment of a Catholic Englishman concerning a late book ntitled *Triplici nodo triplex cuneus* (1608)." After quoting King James' words of reprobation of the enormity, he adds: All of which epithets for the due detestation of so rash and einous an attempt, Catholics no less than Protestants do illingly admit."[1] He refers to the conspiracy as "this oeful attempt of these unfortunate gentlemen,"[2] and as that headlong action of these few Catholic gentlemen."[3] Nothing is known of any attempt on the part of Parsons o exculpate the Jesuits or to defend Garnett; although one ould think the need were imperative.[4] The silence is ignificant.

[1] P. 6. [2] *Ibid.* [3] P. 7.

[4] Sir Charles Cornwallis says that Creswell was proposing to write a book, edicated to the King of Spain, in which he would prove that the plot was really the ork of the Council. Winwood's *Memorials*, vol. ii. p. 277.

CHAPTER XI

BREAKING THE BARRIERS

PARSONS had now practically secured the monopoly of Eng land as a mission of the Society. But in so doing he brough about his own downfall. His behaviour to Bishop and Charnoc and to the four envoys became known; and his credit wa falling rapidly with the Pope, who had at this moment a seriou quarrel with the Society in Spain.[1] He had to meet oppositio which came from a quarter which proved too strong for him We have referred to the dissatisfied state of the seminaries.

"One result of these domestic disturbances was to tur the minds of many to other places where they might bot continue their studies, and when on the mission to be able t keep clear of either of the contending parties. Their thought naturally turned to that great order which had converted Eng land, and which was so bound up with the glories of their Churc The Benedictines were men of peace too, and had an old tradi tion at their back; and, though ready to adapt themselves t new circumstances, were not lovers of novelty. Besides, ther was nothing in the life of a monk to prevent him from takin up mission work in face of sufficient cause and when duly calle upon; for had not they been the great missionaries of Europe?"[2]

The story has been recently told at length. Here it wi

[1] Clement VIII. had reason to be discontented with the Society. In 1601 son Jesuit theologians at Alcalà maintained the proposition: *Dicere hunc Papam non es Papam non est contra fidem.* When Clement heard of this in the March 1602 l became greatly excited, and wrote off at once to the Nuncio, saying "that words fa him to say sufficient of this business." The inculpated Jesuits, "Spaniards, Go knows of what low breed" (as Clement calls them), were imprisoned in the Inquis tion. They found a champion in Fr. Creswell the Jesuit, who went to the Nunc and begged him to defend them, for they were all saints and the only bulwark of th Church!

[2] Author's *The English Black Monks of St. Benedict*, vol. ii. pp. 2, 3.

suffice to touch only upon such points as bear upon our subject. Beginning in 1587, the exodus from the seminaries to the monasteries went on, first in Italy, where students joined houses of the Cassinese Congregation, and then, some ten years after, in Spain. Cardinal Allen seeing at last the effects of Parsons' schemes, "looked with an encouraging eye upon the new movement, and most heartily espoused the cause."[1]

The English in the Cassinese Congregation had, by 1594, become so numerous that the General Chapter of that year petitioned the Holy See to grant them leave to work in their native country. This was an attempt to break down the wall Parsons had managed to set round the English mission. The old Marian priests had died out, and the ranks were filled by clergy trained in seminaries under the Jesuits, and depending upon them for their faculties. At the present moment no one could enter England as a priest or exercise his duties independently of the Society. But Parsons knew well that Benedictine missionaries in England would be altogether independent; so he set himself steadily to oppose, by all means in his power, what he considered as an encroachment on the part of those he styled, at a later date, "the adversaries of his order." He succeeded for the moment in getting the petition of the Cassinese Chapter rejected. In 1601, a petition came from England imploring the aid of Benedictines as missionaries; and the Spanish ambassador, who, as usual, had backed up Parsons in his former opposition, now received instructions from home to support the petition which the English monks in Spain were also (1601) sending to Rome. The Italians renewed theirs. Parsons fought on desperately against the petitions. But by this time he was losing his credit with the Pope. "The repeated applications and continual objections coming always from the same interested quarter . . . revealed to the Pope the true nature of the opposition."[2] The petition was granted, 20th March 1602, and confirmed on 5th December of that same year, after a last attempt to get its withdrawal. Henceforth the wall was broken down, and Benedictines re-entered upon their ancestral patrimony.

[1] *Ibid.* See his letter, p. 6.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 21.

It was in Spain that the movement towards the Benedictine Order met with the greatest opposition from the Jesuits in charge of Parsons' seminaries. The story is useful as showing the distinct line of policy adopted by the English Jesuits. We receive here a great deal of curious information from the *Annales Collegii Anglorum Vallesoletani*,[1] written by Fr. Blackfan, S.J., some time about 1618, when he was rector. He was an eyewitness and partaker in what he describes. We are fortunately able to fill up the *lacunæ* in his personal narrative from other unimpeachable and personal sources. Fr. Blackfan shall begin the story. The curtain opens on the year 1599, at which date he was the minister or procurator of the college.

"At the beginning of the year there died of fever in the college, Fr. John Gervase, a student and a priest, who was a man of rare virtue and an example to all. A few days before his death, he called to him the father minister indicating that he had something to say to him which might tend to the common good. When the father had sat down by him he began: 'Your reverence, for the love of God watch over the students, for I see that some of them are excited by all kinds of ideas, and that they are praising up the Benedictine Order because they see them riding on their mules through the streets with their servants before them, with so much pomp and authority. And only last night when the infirmarian through forgetfulness had left the light burning by me, there came in, in the middle of the night, a figure clad in the habit of St. Benedict, though whether it was a man or a demon clothed in human form I know not. This figure had his face covered by his hood, and after making a profound reverence before me, he suddenly disappeared, leaving me trembling with all my hair on end with fright. And now I am perplexed as to what it could have been or what evil it portended to the whole college.' The minister took all this to be a dream of a delirious brain and soothed him, telling him to be at peace for if God deigned to grant a vocation to any of the students he should take it as a favour, and 'God forbid that this

[1] The MS. of these *Annales* belongs to the college at Ushaw. The English Jesuits have printed them for private circulation (1899).

should be looked on as an unlucky omen, to be averted by some effort.' The priest died peacefully ten days later, leaving us great hopes that he had attained to the harbour of eternal peace."

We must here for a while take leave of Blackfan, and follow up the story of the first student, Mark Barkworth, who joined the Benedictines from the Valladolid seminary. Blackfan, curiously enough, does not mention the incident, though he took a prominent part therein. W. C., in *A Reply unto a Certain Libel lately set forth by Father Parsons* [1603], is the authority. "The first (*example*) shall be of Mark Barkworth, now, I trust, in heaven. This Mark Barkworth, being a priest in the college of Valladolid, was by the Jesuits suspected to be a furtherer and concurrer with certain youths that entered into the order of St. Benedict. Whereof Father Parsons having intelligence did write to the Rector of that college, that he should be dismissed presently, showing in his letters some anger that he stayed so long. Whereupon the minister of the college[1] came unto him one morning [being sick of a fever and not well recovered], and bade him rise and make himself ready to walk with him, saying that it would be wholesome for him to walk and shake off his fever, and not yield thereto. When they were departed out of the English college, he led him into the college of the Jesuits, and, leaving him in a paved room, he took occasion to depart from him upon some affairs, to speak with one of his fellow-Jesuits in that house. And coming back again unto him, he brought the Rector of the Jesuit college with him: who entered into an invective and bitter discourse against him, and the conclusion was as followeth: He commanded him to put off his scholar's robe, to put on a suit of rags (which they offered him), to depart the college and city, and shift for himself; saying that he was not worthy to stay longer there, neither should, and that for a *viaticum* to help himself in his travel he should not have so much as a Spanish *real*, which is but sixpence English. Mark Barkworth, perceiving their intentions, told them that he would not depart with such disgrace, having not offended; in that, if he had concurred with the foresaid youths for their

[1] Blackfan.

entrance into religion, yet was it not such a fault as could deserve such expulsion: their wills not being in his power to rule or command. The Rector, seeing he would not despoil himself and put on those rags to depart, called in certain of lay brethren, strong fellows, to deal with him by violence, and to enforce him to change his habit. Whereof two coming unto him, catched him by the legs, and, pulling them from under him upon a sudden, threw him backward flat upon the pavement, with such violence [being sick and weak with a fever] that he was much bruised therewith, and in a great maze; presently, upon his fall, the rest of the lay brethren apprehended, some a leg, some an arm, and so drew him into another room, paved in like manner, as in those hot countries all rooms for the most part are. He being, as I say, thus amazed and perceiving them to pull and hale him, fearing belike that they would murder him, used these words but in the Spanish tongue: *What, will you kill me? will you kill me? Let me first confess me.*

"When they had thus dragged him into the other room with struggling and striving, he got upon his feet. No sooner was he up and recollected, but one of them gave him such a blow with his fist upon the face, that he felled him down backward again. With this blow he was so bruised in his face that when he was cold, afterwards he was not able to utter his words, that one though near him might well understand him what he spake. Whilst this was in hand, and the Rector of the Jesuit college and the minister of the English college, Fr. Blackfan, spectators of his cruel and inhuman tragedy, in came a Spanish Jesuit of a noble house in Spain, and finding them in this sort, abusing so outrageously this priest, he reproved them for it, and told them it would be a greater shame unto them if the world should be witness thereof. Hereupon they left off, and having better bethought themselves of this fact so outrageously committed, they entreated him to keep silence thereof, and not to make the other scholars acquainted herewith, and they would kindly entreat him hereafter; he should have large faculties, a good *viaticum* when he went to England and all the friendship they could show him else. Hereunto he seeming to yield, they privily conveyed him back to the English

college, and brought him to a sequestered chamber, where he lay until his recovery. But some of the scholars, that there were in the college [as there were not then above nine or ten, the rest being sent away to another place for fear of the plague, at that time in the city], seeing him come in all bruised, began to suspect some ill measure. So that, notwithstanding their secret conveying him into a sequestered chamber, they found him out and resorted unto him; which one of the Jesuits perceiving, spake unto them saying: *Take heed, come not near him, for all verily think he hath the plague.* This speech they gave out, to fear the scholars from resorting unto him, that they might not see into what plight they had brought him. But for all they could do, they could not hinder them, but that they would and did see him. The physicians being sent for unto him, and feeling of his pulse, not knowing what had happened said, that he had suffered great violence; by which you may guess how strangely he was handled in this combat. I know there be divers that will think this history strange and incredible; but if it chance that Master *Charles Paget* do but set down the actions of Fr. Holt, especially concerning Master Godfrey Fouljeam [the very cause of whose death he was], you shall see more strange matters than this. As for the proof of this history of Mark Barkworth, myself have heard it related of three or four several parties witness thereof; and such as desired more certainly herein, I refer them unto those that were then in the college of Valladolid, and saw him in this extremity, and heard him afterwards deliver the whole course of their proceedings with him in the Jesuit college as here is set down. Of which number some are priests who have, upon their faith and fidelity, delivered the story thus unto me [as after his own mouth], and their own eyes being witness to part of it."[1]

After thus filling up the narrative of Blackfan, we can let him go on with his story for a while.

"Well, a few days later one of the students[2] came to the minister saying that he had a great desire to serve under the standard of St. Benedict. The minister received him quietly,

[1] *A Reply to Fr. Parsons' Libel*, pp. 69, 70.

[2] This was John White or Bradshaw, afterwards known as Fr. Augustine.

and sent him to the confessor in order that he might examin the matter thoroughly, and see whether the vocation were fro God or not. As he approved of it, the minister, who was the doing the duty of the absent rector, took him himself to th Royal Monastery of San Benito, and handed him over to th prior and other superiors with as much show of affection a possible. Not long after there came another singing the sam tune, and like the other he was transferred to the order."

What Blackfan passes over in two lines we are able t give in detail. This other student who sang "the same tune was John Roberts.[1] Lewis Owen, in *The Running Register recording a True Relation of the States of the English College Seminaries, and Cloisters in all Foreign Parts, Together with brief and compendious Discourse of the Lies, Practices, Cozen ages, Impostures, and Deceits of all our English Monks, Friar Jesuits, and Seminary Priests in general* [1626], tells us th story of Roberts, who, it appears, was a relative of the writer

"When the student went off from the seminary, the Jesuit (knowing full well Roberts to be a turbulent spirit, and on that was like to cross them in their affairs here in England repaired with all speed to the Lord Abbat of that abbey, an with open mouths exclaimed against *Roberts*, saying that h was a very deboyshed fellow; a common mover and breede of debates in their college, a notorious drunkard, a profan blasphemer and swearer, and withal one whom they suspecte to be no good Catholic, but rather a spy or an intelligence sent hither out of England, and that they had given hi sundry private corrections for many heinous crimes an offences not fit to be nominated. But, in the end, whe they perceived there was no hope of amendment in him, bu rather that he grew daily to be worse and worse, the expulsed him out of their college, and gave him a sufficien *viaticum* to bring him to his country or some other part protesting withal they did not speak this for any malice tha they bare him, but because the Lord Abbat and the rest o those religious monks should not think hardly of them or an other English Catholics by reason of his lewd behaviour

[1] This was the Father Roberts who founded St. Gregory's Monastery at Dou and suffered for his conscience, 10th December 1610.

The Abbat, of course, told this to Roberts, who, in defence, denied the charge *in toto*, and to prove it offered to go back to the college, where he knew he would be received. Said the Abbat: "It stands not with his [*the Jesuit Superior's*] reputation to entertain such a lewd fellow as he reports you to be; and if he will this, you shall stay there some few days, and then come hither to me, and I will entertain you and as many students as shall come away with you."

The trial was made successfully. Roberts was received back in the college with open arms, "and was in as great favour and grace with the Jesuits as formerly he had been." The Abbat in due time took him back, "demurring not a little at the unnatural and unchristian-like dealing of the English Jesuits towards their own countryman."[1]

Blackfan takes up his parable once more: "About two months later when all the students were spending a holiday in the gardens belonging to the college by the riverside, when they had to return at night-time, it was found that four of their number were missing. These were anxiously sought for that night along the river bank and in all the neighbourhood, but they were not to be found. Next morning the father vice-Rector and the other fathers went out to the different monasteries to look for them; but all in vain, for not a trace of them could be found anywhere. Next day, however, it was discovered that they had gone off to a certain farm in the suburbs which belonged to the Benedictines, and that they were there awaiting the pleasure of the Abbat, who had invited them to take the habit in his monastery." He then accuses the Benedictines of being "emulous of our glory and desiring also to put their sickle into this harvest" (the English Mission). And for this purpose they, according to him, enticed away the students. "These, seeing that they were so run after, began to be somewhat puffed up and to neglect the discipline of the house, or rather to despise it altogether. They began to get lax in their zeal for study and prayer, and to hold private meetings among themselves, and when they were rebuked for any fault they would give themselves insolent airs and answer the superiors back. The fathers of the Society were astonished

[1] See author's *The English Black Monks of St. Benedict*, vol. ii. pp. 11–15.

at this new state of things; and those who were charged wit the discipline in the college redoubled their vigilance and car trying in some cases to win them over with gentle words, an persuade them to come back to a better mind, and correctin others by imposing small penances on them to learn the self-restraint; but all in vain, for they had themselves resolve on what they would do.

"It happened then one day, when all was ripe for th tumult, that one of them who was a priest and was the *bedellus* of his class, whose office it was to ring the be as the signal for going to lecture, deliberately neglected h duty, and when he was rebuked, answered, 'We don't want lecture to-day.' This reply was naturally disapproved of, an he was told to do penance in the refectory at supper-tim But this he refused to do, and so the next day the penanc was made a little heavier. However, as he absolutely an proudly refused to submit to it, and was altogether refractor a discussion took place as to what had better be done wit him. It was unanimously agreed that he should be separate from the rest and shut up in his own room, and there b brought by salutary meditations to recognise and acknowledg his fault, that he might make a more satisfactory repentanc A servant was sent to move his bed and other belongings int the place determined on, but when he found this out, h barricaded himself in his room and opposed the servant entrance by vigorously brandishing a broom. The minist ran up to try and overawe him by his authority, but had t retire vanquished; whereupon a certain father of robu temper, who had always loved a conflict and a triumph, a once rushed on the scene, and turning his back towards th adversary so that he might receive his blows on the safer plac threw himself on him, and got him upon his back upon th bed on which he had been standing. While he struggled wit him to wrest the stick from his hands, the student called ou so as to be heard all over the house, 'Help! students, help they are offering violence to a priest!' At this cry all th birds of a feather flocked to the spot armed like soldier with sticks which they had designedly taken from the broom running hither and thither with noise and tumult just as if the

had taken the town by storm and were flying on the spoil. They attacked the Rector and other fathers they met with terrible imprecations, and shouted that they were going off at once to the Nuncio. The Rector, lest the scandal should leak out, ordered the doors to be locked and hid the keys; but towards evening he allowed the students to go where they would. He sent, however, a spy [explorator] after them to watch their movements. They made at once for the Benedictine monastery, and there the Abbat, having heard their story, bade them return in peace to the seminary while he did what he could at the Nuncio's,[1] whither he went without delay. That same evening the Rector, Peter Rues, and Creswell the vice-Rector also went to the Nuncio, but they found him already prepossessed by the Abbat. He would hardly listen to them. The Rector ventured upon saying 'that His Holiness had not acted indiscreetly in permitting rebellious spirits of this sort to meddle in the affairs of the English Mission.' 'And so, forsooth!' exclaimed his illustrious Lordship, 'he would fain dictate to His Holiness what he ought to do in the government of the Church!' and at once he cries out, 'Bring fetters here that he may be chained and kept in strict custody till it be settled what shall be done with him!' And when the Rector in consternation at this sentence threw himself upon his knees and humbly prayed for pardon for his fault if he had committed one, and Father Creswell joined in making many applications, at last the Nuncio commanded, as though making a great concession, that he should be removed from the city as quickly as possible, and that another rector should be appointed in his place, which was done not so long after."

Twelve students were at once received into the Benedictine order, and within a few months they were joined by thirteen more. One of the twelve was the well-known Dom Leander Jones, the friend of Laud. That there was serious mismanagement cannot be doubted. During Creswell's time the number at Valladolid ran down from seventy-two to forty. Parsons, from Rome, watched events with dismay, and wrote to check Creswell (12th September 1604): "I have found by long experience absolutely the best way to quiet and hold peaceable

[1] The Nuncio was Gemnasco, who had had the trouble with the Jesuits at Alcalà.

our youths is to let them alone and be sparing in dealing with them, for the more solicitous and watchful we seem towards them (which they call jealousy) the worse they are." So bad indeed, did things become that in 1607 the General had to send a special visitor. Creswell was soon removed. Being a favourite at the Spanish Court, he ultimately succeeded Parsons as Prefect of the Mission.

A few words on the after history of the seminaries in the Peninsula. The Valladolid seminary was of little practical good to the English Catholics. The number of priests that it furnished to the Mission was very small; and no inconsiderable number of the students became Jesuits. The weak point in the administration was to be found in the mutual jealousies which existed between the Spanish Jesuits in whose province the seminary was, and the English Jesuits, who rightly enough thought they were the more capable of dealing with their fellow-countrymen. From the beginning, and during all the disturbances we have dwelt on, the rectors were foreigners. Then illness from plague and from the insanitary condition of the house attacked the wretched students over and over again; poverty pursued them, for the recent events had alienated their benefactors. There was even a dearth of bread. Discipline fell and studies were neglected. When in 1608 Parsons heard of the state he sent for Blackfan, who was then in Rome as Confessor to the English college, and told him to go to Spain and save the seminary, which was at its last extremity. Blackfan tells us that when he arrived he found most of the students ill in bed, and the others pale, thin, squalid, and looking more like ghosts than men. By bringing youths from St. Omer, which was a fruitful nursery for the seminary, the numbers were restored. But it is noteworthy that in 1610, while Blackfan was again minister, a similar disturbance broke out; but this time, according to our annalist, it was the Dominicans who "wanted to put their sickle into this harvest." Some more youths whom he describes as light-minded and no lovers of discipline left the seminary and joined the friars, and told the Dominician prior that there were others who dared not disclose their desire of following them lest they should be badly treated by the Jesuits. So off went a "grave" friar

the seminary, and threatened the Jesuits with all the pains and penalties of excommunication if they dared to interfere with the vocations. The Rector protested he had done nothing of the sort. But as six others promptly left, and as Fr. Blackfan was sent away to England, it is possible that "someone had blundered" again. It was not until 1614 that Philip III., hearing the college was in such a bad state, determined that for the future Englishmen only should preside over the institution. He wrote to Aquaviva to this effect, and in spite of much opposition from the Spanish Jesuits, succeeded in gaining his point. Fr. William Weston of Wisbeach and devil-hunting fame was appointed rector. There is little else to report. Blackfan returned in 1616 as rector, and there is extant at Simancas a correspondence between him and Creswell concerning the latter's administration. There was but little love lost between the two. The whole correspondence is interesting and should see the light.

The other seminaries are too insignificant to call for any further mention. But we may, before dismissing Blackfan, refer to his attempt to get hold of a new foundation that was being made at Lisbon. Don Pedro de Coutinho (1621–22), a noble Portuguese, was about to found another seminary; but it was to be, according to his express words, committed solely to the Clergy as administrators. In a letter to Cardinal Farnese he says that the Jesuits both at Madrid and Lisbon oppose the design of founding the seminary unless it be given over into their hands. They used threats, especially the Englishman, Father Francis Forcer, that they would secure it in spite of the founder's desires; therefore he writes to the Cardinal that it should be known in Rome that "he in no way desires the fathers of the Society to rule the college," and that if they are admitted under any pretext he will withdraw his gift.[1] John Bennett, the agent for the Clergy in Rome, writes four months afterwards (31st July 1622) that in Rome the Jesuits were still intriguing to get the seminary, and had "persuaded a great man to inform the Congregation that the founder had changed his mind and granted them the government."[2] But, better informed, the

[1] *Tierney*, vol. iv. pp. cclviii–cclx.

[2] *Ibid.* p. cclxi.

cardinals ordered that the General of the Jesuits should be commanded to restrain his brethren. But this did not satisfy the Jesuits, who "wrought the Inquisitor General to help them to possess the college of Lisbon."[1] The disgraceful proceeding was brought before the Pope, who "spake like a good pastor and upright judge," and issued a decree eternally excluding the Jesuits by name from the seminary.

While this was going on, a similar attempt at grasping was proceeding at Madrid, where the Clergy had a small residence. Bennett reports (18th December 1622): "This the Jesuits would take into their possession and give us a *casa professa* of theirs out of the town. They were busy valuing and measuring, and expected only answer from their General here to enter possession. . . . I put our information hereof before His Holiness, and supplicated that such unlawful merchandising with other men's goods, without their consent, was not permitted. I have also a prohibition for this, and the General warned he attempt no such thing."[2]

These accounts are useful as showing the tendency of the Jesuit policy. In a defence of the Valladolid seminary, and in fact, a general defence, a recent writer in *The Month*,[3] after saying that "the exigency of the case before us requires that we should recognise faults in the Jesuits in their conduct towards others, and faults not of human frailty only,"[4] takes his stand as follows: "The burthen of the adverse charges is that the Jesuits aimed at attaining powers which no combination of circumstances could justify them in assuming, that they endeavoured to depress or set aside duly constituted authorities in order to have free scope for their usurped jurisdiction, and also that they made use of all means, even those that were unfair and dishonourable, in order to attain the ends they had in view. Such allegations cannot possibly be substantiated. The talk of their unscrupulousness and their depressing rivals has no foundation in anything that really existed in fact, and the assertion that they coveted powers which could *never* be justly theirs is also quite false as it stands. It bears, however, a certain similarity to the moderate indictment which can,

[1] *Ibid.* p. cclxv.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] No. 423 (September 1899).
[4] P. 242.

think, be fairly urged against the fathers. There is a love of power which is holy and a readiness to take the lead which is commendable, and the Jesuits, while taking the lead in reforming abuses and advancing knowledge, can, so far, only deserve our praise. Their error was that they were sometimes imperious or imprudent in their use of the power they had honourably acquired, or that they continued to maintain dominant positions, which an emergency had quite justified their assuming, when that justifying emergency was passing away."[1]

Writing for a particular class of readers, *The Month* adopts an optimistic tone, which, however, an intimate knowledge of the story as a whole does not allow us to admit. But we must say that, by its valuable admissions, it now compares favourably with that adopted by the earlier Jesuit apologists, who would not allow the least possibility of "ours" not being in all things perfect.

Parsons saw his house of cards tumbling down. But this wonderful man (for whatever judgment one may pass upon him and his designs, no one can refrain from admiring his entire devotion to the one end of his life, and his unwearied activity in carrying out what he conjectured was to that purpose), this wonderful man, I say, never during all these toils and turmoils lost heart. In a letter to a friend (25th July 1601), he says: "I hope their malignity shall never break my sleep."[2] He found time during this period, not only to publish the *Brief Apologie*, a Latin version of the same book, the *Manifestation of the Folly*, works of the controversy of the moment, but also to bring out a new edition with considerable addition of Sander's work, *De Schismate Anglicana*, to which he joined a most valuable supplement, the Journal of Edward Rishton, for five years a prisoner in the Tower. A controversial work entitled *A Temperate Ward-word of the Turbulent and Seditious Watch-word of Sir Francis Hastings, Knight*, appeared in 1599; and two years after *An Apologetical Epistle: directed to the Right Honourable Lords and others of Her Majesty's Privy Council.* The next year was marked with *The Warn-word to Sir Francis Hastings' Wast-word.*

[1] P. 243.

[2] Oliver's *Collections*, p. 162.

Whereunto is adjoined a briefe rejection of an insolent . . . Minister marked with the letter O. E.[1] From Garnett's correspondence we see about this time there was a talk of a Latin translation of his *Book of Resolutions*, a book of which, by the way, Parsons praises anonymously: "Only one book among them, namely, that of the *Christian Directory or Resolution*, is known to have gained more souls to God than all these men joined together can ever hope to do, etc."[2]

His political schemes, too, had come to naught, even when he added the rôle of match-maker to his other occupations. After giving up the Infanta as successor to the English Crown, he wanted to marry Arabella Stuart to Cardinal Farnese, who was a descendant of John of Gaunt. The spectacle of that "grave and reverend man," Father Parsons, thus disposing of the English Crown, tickled the sense of the ridiculous in Rome. A paper was found one morning on the statue of Pasquino which informed Maforio: "If there be any man that will buy the kingdom of England, let him repair to a merchant in a black square cap in the city, and he shall have a very good pennyworth thereof."

The Jesuit had failed. Clement VIII., never very friendly to the Society, had found that he had been misled, and the quiet succession of James caused the Pope to look with an eye of displeasure upon the man who had led him into so many false positions. Summoning Aquaviva to his presence, he announced he had received so many complaints about Fr. Parsons that he was determined to banish him from the court and city of Rome. It was probably by the address or the warning of the General that Parsons was able to evade the actual sentence of exile. On the score of health he left Rome and went to Naples, where he remained until some months after the death of Clement VIII. (March 1605). The exact cause, as well as the precise date, of this disgrace is difficult to discover; but it is known that it was at the instance of the French ambassador that he was banished. It also appears that Parsons was sent away when Clement was hoping to negotiate with James. The Nuncio Del Bufalo writes to this

[1] Matthew Sutcliffe, Dean of Exeter.
[2] *A Briefe Apologie*, p. 188.

effect to Cardinal Aldobrandini (23rd February 1604).[1] But Parsons himself does not seem to have quite known which particular one of his intrigues had been the last straw to break the Pontiff's patience.

In a letter from Garnett to Parsons (4th and 21st October 1605) reference is made to a story that "Father Parsons procured Mr. Thomas Fitzherbert to be Pope's secretary (and) extracteth first an oath that Mr. Fitzherbert should discover all the secrets; which oath prevailing against all the other second oaths taken to the Pope himself, divers secrets were known, which Clement knew must needs be discovered by his secretary Fitzherbert, who either by torture or fear of the same, disclosed his former oath to Father Parsons, who thereupon fled to Naples." Garnett describes this story as a "jest."[2] There is probably this amount of truth in it, namely, that Parsons was known to have an incurable itching to meddle in all affairs; and it is by no means improbable that he directed Fitzherbert, who was induced to consult him. In May 1605 Parsons asks his General for permission to return; and in a letter to a friend he says: "Two points only now I stand upon, as you shall see by my letter to Father General,—the first that I may have license to return presently if I wax worse; but if I grow better, and that Father General will have me stay abroad, that you get out of him upon what grounds, that is, who are the causes, to wit, Spain, France, the Pope, etc.; how long it is meant, what I may answer to them that do urge me in that point: whether he will not be content that I use some diligence to remove these obstacles; and the like."[3] Two things seem clear from the above—Father Parsons was really ill at the present time; and Aquaviva acquiesced in the necessity of the exile.

It is during this period that some of the following works of Father Parsons were probably written: *A Treatise of the Three Conversions of England, containing an Examination of the Calendar or Catalogue of Protestants Saints . . . devised by Fox*, by N. D. Preface dated November 1603. This work

[1] *Barbevini MSS.* xxxi. vol. 75.
[2] *Tierney*, vol. iv. p. cv.
[3] *Ibid.* p. cv. note.

appeared in two divisions. Then follows *A Review of Ten Public Disputations or Conferences held . . . under King Edward and Queen Mary*, by N. D., 1604; and *A Revelation of the Trial made before the King of France upon the year* 1600 *between the Bishop of Evereux and the Lord Plessis Mornay*, by N. D., 1604.

Clement VIII. was succeeded by Leo XI. (1st April 1605), who also was not friendly to the Society; and during his short reign (only twenty-seven days) Parsons remained in exile. But on the election of Paul V. (Camillo Borghese), the former vice-protector of the English college (16th May 1605), he obtained leave to return, and found in the new Pontiff an old friend, who allowed the Jesuit to regain some of his influence in the *Curia*.

Before closing this chapter it will be well to carry on the subject with which it began. Some little time before the Plot, the English Benedictine monks of the Spanish Congregation obtained in the town of Douai a house, and formed therein a community, which in the course of centuries has found a home at St. Gregory's Abbey, Downside, Bath. This foundation in the immediate neighbourhood of the English college, which was now presided over by his vowed ally, alarmed Parsons, who saw in it the destruction of all his plans regarding that college. He set Worthington, the president, and Fathers Coniers and Baldwin to prevent the monks from settling in Douai. They attacked the Benedictines in Brussels at the archducal court, and when the cause was moved to Madrid, Creswell undertook the case. In Rome itself Parsons led on the opposition. He drew up a memorial, which contains as many false charges against the Benedictines as it does clauses. One of his letters to Worthington at this period has been preserved:

"RIGHT REV. SIR,—I have received (*yours*) of the 29th of October, in answer whereof I hoped I should have been able to have satisfied you of some resolution concerning your chief suit between your neighbours and your college; but hitherto nothing being as yet determined, I must refer you to the next, for we think certainly the matter will be ended now out of

hand. The letters you sent by the last are received and are well liked. If the others you mention in these come in time (*added in the margin*, now they be come in very good time) they will be to good purpose, if not Almighty God will supply with the rest, for we have had letters enough to show the truth, and we doubt not but Almighty God will work by them that which shall be to His greater glory; although not perhaps in such sorts as seems best to us.

"Concerning F. Gibbons;[1] I am very glad to see him willing to spend his labours in reading that lesson of [*divinity?*] you mention in the college. And as I am desirous to please you either in that or any other sort, so if his superiors there be contented, I shall be glad you may enjoy his labours, which I know his learning and experience will make very profitable to your scholars, etc."[2]

But even with a more than friendly Pope, he was not the power he had been. In spite of high-handed methods (Giffard removed from his deanery as a friend to the Benedictines,[3] the Nuncio in Flanders cashiered, and Lord Arundel's troop disbanded for having a Benedictine as chaplain-general), he failed. The Benedictines settled at Douai after all, waxed strong, and opened other houses, and were able to assist the Clergy in their struggle for liberty. From Parsons' standpoint, he was perfectly justified in his opposition to the Benedictines. They were the one element in England which at that moment could successfully hinder his projects. Feeling that his methods were the only ones for regaining England, he felt himself bound to oppose the introduction of other orders and other methods. The Benedictines were particularly dangerous to his projects, for they had the glamour of tradition round

[1] Gibbons was the confessor. He evidently was proposed by Worthington as a professor.

[2] *Catholic Miscellany*, vol. ii. p. 206.

[3] "It is very ill taken here that the Archduke hath banished Giffard from his deanery, which Mr. Paget reporteth with very great spleen towards the Archduke, pretending the only reason thereof to be Baldwin and Owen, two arch-traitors, and for no other cause saving that he was much affected to the Queen of Scots, mother of His Majesty that now is. The truth in his absence is much lamented, as of a special intelligencer for these parts which themselves here now are not ashamed to confess." Richard Blount to Parsons (14th July 1606), Foley, vol. i. p. 63.

about them, and their methods savoured not of the new ways.[1] His actions were logical and consistent if we grant his premises. But unless we can adopt them we shall fail to recognise in him one who can safely be chosen as a hero.

[1] The Jesuits' dislike of the Benedictine Order is strange, considering all that their Founder owed to the monks both at Montserrat and Monte Cassino.

CHAPTER XII

THE OATH

ONE result of the Powder Treason was to give James and his Government an excuse to renew, with more rigour, the persecution of the unfortunate English Catholics. An Oath of Allegiance was framed and passed by both Houses, and in it there was inserted by Archbishop Bancroft, at the suggestion of Christopher Perkins, an ex-Jesuit, a special clause denying those temporal prerogatives of the Holy See which the Society advocated. The words of this Oath, which caused much misery and discussion, are as follows:—

"I, A. B., do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify, and declare in my conscience before God and the world, that our sovereign lord King James is lawful and rightful King of this realm and all other His Majesty's dominions and countries; and that the Pope, neither of himself, nor by any authority of the Church or See of Rome, or by any other means with any other, hath any power or authority to depose the King or to dispose of any of His Majesty's kingdoms or dominions, or to authorise any foreign princes to invade or annoy him or his countries; or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance and obedience to His Majesty; or to give licence or leave to any of them to bear arms, raise tumults, or to offer any violence or hurt to His Majesty's royal person, state or government, or to any of His Majesty's subjects within His Majesty's dominion.

"Also I swear from my heart, that, notwithstanding any declaration or sentence of excommunication or deprivation made or granted or to be made or granted by the Pope or his successors, or by any authority derived or pretended to be derived from him or his See, against the said King, his heirs

or successors, or any absolution of the said subjects from their obedience, I will bear faith and true allegiance to His Majesty, his heirs and successors, and him and them I will defend to the uttermost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever which shall be made against him or their persons, their crown and dignity, by reason or colour of any such sentence or declaration or otherwise, and will do my best endeavour to disclose and make known unto His Majesty, his heirs and successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies, which I shall know or hear of to be against him or any of them. *And I do further swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure as impious and heretical this damnable doctrine and position—that princes, which may be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever.* And I do believe and in my conscience am resolved that neither the Pope nor any other person whatsoever hath power to absolve me of this oath or any part thereof, which I acknowledge by good and lawful authority to be lawfully ministered unto me; and do renounce all pardons and dispensations to the contrary.

"And these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to these express words by me spoken, and according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words; without any equivocation or mental evasion or secret reservation whatsoever. And I do make this recognition and acknowledgment heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the true faith of a Christian.—So help me God."

An examination of this oath with the circumstances of the case will enable us to understand the action of various parties. James had been trying in vain to get the Pope to promise he would not excommunicate him, and it may be noticed that in this form of oath the spiritual power of the Pope is noways denied; only the temporal claims.[1] But these temporal claims were the real point at issue. They were, so

[1] Foley, however, says: "In this oath they were made to swear—(1) Allegiance to James I. not only as their lawful King, but as Supreme Head of the Church in England; (2) an open and formal denial of the headship of the Sovereign Pontiff in all matters ecclesiastical" (ii. p. 475). It is difficult to imagine that Foley ever read the actual text or expected his readers would.

some held, included in the general commission of superintendence which was given to the Vicar of Christ. Hence to reject them was to reject the ordinance of God, and to question the Pope's absolute right to dispose of kingdoms for the benefit of religion was rather to broach a heresy than to hazard an opinion. Says the Jesuit controversialist Bellarmine: "Most certain it is that, in whatsoever words the Oath is conceived by the adversaries of the faith in that kingdom, it tends to this end, that the authority of the Head of the Church, in England, may be transferred from the successor of St. Peter to the successor of King Henry VIII.[1] It is worth while noticing that the Jesuits at that date upheld the rights of the people as against kings, but ignored them when it came to the Pope's right of disposing of countries.

While for the sake of peace the King of France was urging that gentleness should be shown to the King, the Jesuits in Flanders had been urging on the Pope to severe action; during the sitting of that Parliament which passed the Bill imposing the Oath two Jesuits from Brussels arrived in Rome to stir up the Pope.[2] He had lately sent a secret messenger to the King, and the mission had failed. He also had written to the King, but his letters met with no reply. So after this rebuff, Paul V., the Borghese, was in no humour to resist the importunities of the Jesuits. Besides this we must take into account that there was within the Church, especially in the northern nations, a growth of a new spirit which caused alarm and has to be reckoned with in estimating the political struggle between the spiritual and temporal powers. An acute observer remarks: "There are two kinds of movements and apparent growth always going on in the Church; one is the fermentation

[1] Bellarmine, *De Rom. Pont.* lib. v. c. i.

[2] *Tierney*, vol. iv. p. clxx. "We know as a matter of fact," de Villerory writes 28th June 1606) to De la Boderie, "that the Jesuits who are with the Archduke of Flanders have lately held a meeting and resolved to complain strongly to the Pope of the treatment Catholics receive in the kingdoms of the said King (*James*), and they pretend to prove that the indulgence and patience with which His Holiness treats him increase the boldness of the authors of such counsels, make the lot of Catholics worse, and will end in their entire destruction. They have sent for this purpose an express messenger to the Pope, one of the chief men of their company, whose exertions will without doubt have effect and will cause an outburst of something extraordinary" De la Boderie, *Ambassade en Angleterre*, tome i. pp. 150–200).

of a moribund school,—for a religious school never cries mor loudly than in its agony, never flings more strongly than in it death-throes; the other is the secret undergrowth, the silen advance of thought, discomforting and ousting the old opinions which in their unsteadiness cry so loudly for protection, an employ the relics of their force at the dictation of their terror for the artificial faith in a dying doctrine becomes fanatica because passion is subject to reason." [1]

So loosely was the form of Oath worded that there wer expressions at which a timid conscience might well hesitate For instance: the Oath itself was ambiguous and denied th power of anyone to dispense with it; even the lawgiver himsel could not release from this Oath, which is absurd. But th intention of that lawgiver, however, is very plain. James in th Premonition to his *Apologie* says that he was careful "tha nothing should be contained in this Oath except the profession of natural allegiance and civil and temporal obedience, with promise to resist to all contrary and uncivil violence." Whe the draft was submitted to him, he struck out a clause repudiat ing the Pope's spiritual right of excommunication.

When the Oath was first published it was received by th Catholics in various ways. While some admitted it as i stood,[2] others would only take it with qualifications. Th Jesuits at the beginning set their faces so consistently against it that the dispute which ensued was called the "Jesui Controversy." Blackwell, who first opposed the Oath, changed his mind; and at a meeting held in June 1606 announced that it might be taken safely.[3] The Jesuits sent the matte

[1] Simpson's *Campion*, p. 489.

[2] Parsons in his *Judgment of a Catholic Englishman* (Nos. 30, 31) writes: "As fo that multitude of priests and laics which, he (*the King*) saith, 'have freely taken th Oath' . . . to deny simply and absolutely that the Pope, as supreme pastor of th Catholic Church, hath any authority left him by Christ, either directly or indirectly with cause or without cause, in never so great a necessity, or for never so great an public an utility of the Christian religion to proceed against any prince whatsoeve temporally for his restraint or amendment, or to permit other princes to do the same this I suppose was never their meaning that took the Oath; for that they shoul thereby contradict the general consent of all Catholic divines, and confess that God' providence for the conservation and preservation of His Church and kingdom upo earth, had been defectuous."

[3] His argument was, that in present circumstances, for the Pope to depose the Kin would be for destruction and not for edification; and as the Pope has no powe

to Rome, where already even before the Oath was passed in Parliament Parsons was at work to secure its condemnation. He drew up a memorial to Cardinal Bellarmine (18th May 1606), in which he declares that the "pernicious Oath" is taken from the doctrine of the appellant priests, thirteen of whom, just before Elizabeth's death, had signed a protestation of allegiance which gave to God the things that were God's, and to Cæsar what belonged to him. There was at this moment going on in Rome another of those weary appeals from the Clergy for bishops; and it was too favourable an opportunity for damaging their cause to let it pass. Parsons suggested that Cecil and Champney, the agents, should be made to subscribe and send into England a protestation against an Oath which was not passed until nine days after the date of the memorial, and the exact terms of which Parsons could not have known. In this document Parsons gives as his reason for thus treating the agents, the extraordinary one that the King will thereby be induced to withdraw his supposed favour from some, and have cause to persecute all with the same severity.[1]

The actual text of the Oath was sent to Rome by Fr. Holtby, the successor of Garnett as Superior in England. There were then forty-two Jesuits in England, and Holtby had ordered them not to write or preach about the Oath nor publicly make any statement concerning it. Foley says that at the meeting in June 1606, "finding a want of firmness and unanimity amongst those assembled, he preferred to wait for an answer from Rome rather than have anything defined by the meeting, even should all agree in rejecting the Oath."[2] The answer was not long in coming. The Oath was condemned in very indefinite terms by Paul V. (September 1606) as containing many things clearly opposed to faith and salvation. This was followed by another Breve to the same effect. Of course such a reply did not settle the dispute. While it was clearly seen that the Pope would not allow the deposing power

for destruction, Catholics could safely swear that he had none. See letter from Mush (11th July 1606), *Tierney*, vol. iv. p. cxxxvi.

[1] "Accioche visto (il scritto) del rè e delli suoi consiglieri intendessero che tutti sacerdoti sono del medesimo parere in questa materia, e cosi non potrébbono perseguitare l'uni più che l'altri, per questa causa" (*Tierney*, vol. iv. p. cxxxii).

[2] Foley, vol. iii. p. 8.

to be denied, on the other hand he did not assert it as a matter of faith. He generalised and condemned the Oath as a whole, without specifying what parts were objectionable. When a piteous appeal went up to Paul from eight priests, prisoners in Newgate, for refusing to take this Oath, and implored him to say what was the part contrary to faith and salvation, a deaf ear was turned to them. It is very possible that the Pope never got the petition. Parsons had the handling of English documents, and did not hesitate to suppress inconvenient ones.

The Archpriest, no longer walking "in union with and fidelity to the Society," remained obstinate in his opinion concerning the lawfulness of the Oath; and when the condemnation was handed to him by the Jesuit Superior, he was greatly pained and loath to publish it. Parsons procured his removal, and George Birkhead was appointed in his place.

Throughout the controversy which raged, the Jesuits were united. If some did modify their opinion under Charles I. and administer the sacraments to those who had taken the Oath, when there was a probability of a Catholic King succeeding in the person of James II., they returned to their former condemnation. But as regards those under their direction, they were not so successful. It was frequently a matter of boasting with Parsons that the principal Catholics in England were under the spiritual care of the Jesuits. Now, taking the case of the Catholic peers, we find from the Journals of the House of Lords, that all, with the single exception of Lord Teynham, who managed to elude it, repeatedly and spontaneously took the condemned Oath. They evidently thought, as Dodd pertinently remarks: "If the Jesuits could find a means to evade the Bull which absolved all subjects from their obedience to Queen Elizabeth, under penalty of excommunication, why could not such as took the Oath of Allegiance make use of the same pretence to excuse themselves from submitting to those Bulls which forbid the Oath of Allegiance?"[1]

It may be here remarked that in the history of the Oath we have a conspicuous example of the evils which come when theologians put forward their opinions and claim for them the acceptance due to the eternal verities of the faith. To lay on

[1] *Secret Policy of the Jesuits*, p. 195.

men's consciences burthens which Christ has not appointed, and to claim for private utterances the force of infallible revelation, can only end in disaster. No one now holds in practice the doctrine of the deposing power, direct or indirect, of the Pope; few there are who even in theory entertain such a proposition. And yet it was made, under the Stuarts, the touchstone of orthodoxy, the cause of untold misery to persecuted Catholics, and a fertile source of mistrust on the part of their fellow-countrymen. The Jesuit theologian Suarez, taking James' proposition "that an excommunicated King can be deposed or killed by anyone," says that, as put forward simply, it is false, for the sentence must contain a clause to that particular effect. A King under sentence of excommunication has no right to order his subjects to obey him, and if he compels them they can resist even by a just war. This Suarez considers most true, and says that the contrary opinion is heretical as against the force and power of the keys of the Church.[1] Though such was the Jesuit teaching, in practice the position became untenable.

Although the Jesuits were the strenuous opponents of the Oath, yet it was given to only one of their number to vindicate his obedience to the Pope's order. And, as usual, it was one of the earnest followers of Campion that obtained the crown for conscience' sake.

Fr. Thomas Garnett, a nephew of Henry Garnett, entered the English mission as one of the Clergy. He came from Valladolid with Mark Barkworth, whom we have mentioned in a preceding chapter. He was admitted into the Society by his uncle, 29th September 1604, and, when on his way to the novitiate in Belgium, was seized and imprisoned. He remained in the Gatehouse for eight or nine months during the imprisonment of his uncle, and a correspondence passed between the two, which the Government intercepted. But as the authorities could produce no evidence to connect him with the Powder Treason, he was banished in 1606 with forty-six other priests, ten of whom were Jesuits. He went to Louvain, and was the first novice professed (2nd July 1607) in the house which Parsons had been lately enabled to found for the English Jesuits.

[1] *Opera Omnia* (ed. 1749), vol. xxi. p. 366.

Returning towards the end of 1607, when on his way to Cornwall, he was betrayed by an apostate priest and, conducted under strong escort to London, was once more back in prison. He was examined before the Bishop of London 17th November 1607, and again 7th April 1608. On this latter occasion he refused again to take the Oath, saying "that he thinketh it would be a violation of the Catholic faith if he should swear that he doth detest and abjure as impious and heretical that doctrine and position, namely, that princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever; because he thinketh that were a violation of the Catholic faith to abjure anything as heretical which the Church hath not defined to be heretical or is not manifest by the Word of God to be heretical. . . . He being further desired to set down some more substantial and pregnant reason why he doth so peremptorily deny to take the Oath, as if in taking it he should violate the Catholic faith, saith that the authority of the two Breves come from Rome do move him (together with divers reasons which he forbeareth to specify) and persuade him that he may not with a safe conscience take the said Oath That he thinketh he should violate his duty to His Majesty i he should swear that, notwithstanding any declaration, etc., a it followeth in all the second section, he will bear faithful and true allegiance to His Majesty, his heirs and successors, etc because these wanted the word, lawful. Secondly, he saith that he is not able to judge of right unto the Crown (if, which God forbid, there should grow a question betwixt some challenger in England and some other out of Scotland), and therefore he may not take the said Oath without violating hi duty to His Majesty."[1]

From the above it will be seen that besides the denial o the deposing power, some thought there were valid and grav reasons why those who respected the sanctity of an oat should refrain from taking one which was not definitely an clearly expressed.

At another examination (15th June 1608), before th Bishop of London and Sir William Wade, he was again presse

[1] Foley, vol. ii. pp. 485, 486.

on the matter of the Oath, and was asked to "hear what the Archpriest Blackwell" had to say upon the question. He only replied: "I wish to take neither advice nor time to deliberate upon the yea or nay to that which others so well know cannot be lawfully done; and as to the Archpriest Blackwell, I need not to hear him in a matter where the Sovereign Pontiff speaks and defines to the contrary." Unable to be persuaded, he was ordered off to Newgate, and his only words were: "My Lord, I am not only ready for Newgate, but to be dragged through Holborn to Tyburn; and death to me is my highest ambition, that I may wholly possess my Jesus, to whom long ago I have given my whole heart."

Four days after at the Old Bailey Sessions he was tried upon the counts that he was a priest, a Jesuit, had seduced His Majesty's subject, and, what was the main point, had refused to take the Oath of Allegiance. The next day he was sentenced to death. He heard his condemnation with great joy; and when some Catholics offered to procure his escape by means of a rope, he said he would "rather be raised up once into the air by a rope than leap down to the ground twice by the same means." The last two days of his life were spent in an underground cell called Limbo. He was laden with heavy chains, according to the usual custom with the condemned. When a friend called him early in the morning of the 23rd of June, the day fixed for his execution, he was found "in his dark cell, rapt in prayer, his eyes brilliant with gladness and joy of soul." His gentle and reverent demeanour moved to tears the Anglican chaplain of Newgate, who in a paper preserved at Stonyhurst speaks in terms of wonder and admiration at the martyr's cheerfulness.[1] At Tyburn, where an immense crowd had gathered, Thomas Cecil, Earl of Exeter, engaged him for half an hour in most earnest conversation, persuading him to take the Oath; for he argued it was, at least, a disputable matter in which faith was not concerned. "My Lord, if the case be so doubtful and disputable, how can I in conscience swear to what is doubtful as if it were certain? No; I will not take the Oath though I might have five thousand lives." Mounting the cart beneath

[1] Foley, vol. ii. p. 500.

the gallows and publicly forgiving by name all who had a hand in his death, with prayers on his lips he passed away. He was a witness by his death to the rights of conscience to hold itself in suspense upon doubtful matter and not to be forced by any exterior authority.

The Jesuits at the end of 1606 were again trying to purchase relief from the Government. The former policy of Henry Garnett was renewed. In a letter from Fr. Blount to Parsons (7th December 1606) we read that he and Lord William Howard[1] "are now busy with the Ambassador of Spain for money, upon condition of some kind of peace with Catholics: whereunto we are moved by the Lord Chamberlain and his wife, promising faithfully that some good shall be done for Catholics. The Ambassador is willing to concur with money. What the end will be is very doubtful; because Salisbury will resist: yet such is the want of money with the Chamberlain at this time (whose expenses are infinite) that either Salisbury must supply or else he must needs break with him and trust to this refuge. Besides, the Chancellor doth much desire to thrust out all the Scottish, of whom they begin to be afraid: seeing now by experience that if the Catholics go down, the Scottish step into their place; for which cause the very Puritans in the Parliament say plainly if they had thought the Scottish should have had all the forfeitures, the last laws should not have been passed."[2] Though James was always in want of money, the proposition was not successful, and Catholics were left to bear the brunt of the persecution.

We get a graphic picture of the times in the two following documents. The first is from a letter of Fr. Edward Coffin, dated 28th May 1611: "The King meditates the extermination of all the Catholics; the prisons are everywhere crammed; the Catholics hide themselves in caves and holes of the earth, and others fly before the face of the persecutors into these parts (*Italy*). An infinite number of pursuivants riotously passes through every county of England, and it is incredible to tell how they harass and afflict the most innocent men; for, entering the houses and lands, they carry off everything—beds, tables, covers, clothes, chests, trunks, and especially

[1] Known as "Bauld Willie."

[2] *Tierney*, vol. iv. p. cxliv.

money. If they find the master of the house they thrust the infamous Oath of Supremacy upon him; and if he refuse to take it they carry him off to the nearest jail, there in poverty and chains, in darkness and squalor, in hunger and nakedness, *vel ducat vitam, vel animam agat.* The times of Elizabeth, although most cruel, were the mildest and happiest in comparison with these of James."[1] Fr. Coffin speaks of course from hearsay. He was one of the priests banished by James on his accession, and became confessor to the English college in Rome. The other document is from the pen of More, the historian, and is headed *Modus vivendi hominum Societatis*, 1616:

"The members of the Society who hitherto have laboured in England for the consolation of Catholics and the conversion of heretics, pending better times, had three modes of living. Some led an entirely private life at home; others were constantly moving about through various localities; while many were free either to confer at home with those who wished or to visit others out of doors.

"For, as by law, capital punishment hung equally over the priests and over those who harboured them in their houses, so when any secular master of a family was raised above the fear of the law, either by nature or grace, or the circumstances of the times, or of the persons among whom he lived, he would adopt a priest, who, in one of the three modes indicated, served the family and administered the sacraments. And as among all classes of men the distribution of the gifts of nature and of grace differs, so among all ranks were to be found those who were more free and those who were more sparing in adopting priests. Those who were opulent and powerful, as having more to lose, and being more exposed to envy, acted more cautiously than the middle or lower classes; neither did they rely upon their own power, so long as they were conscious not only of being subject to those who were still more powerful, but also of being exposed to danger from the informer. But what God had given to the middle and lower class for their moderate sustenance was as dear to them as was that which He had given to the more powerful

[1] Foley, vol. i. pp. 70, 71.

for their abundance; and so, feeling that they had less means of contending against the malice of the enemy, they often became, like the more wealthy, cautious and timid in admitting the service of priests. However, from the commencement of the schism, there were never wanting either priests to expose themselves to the dangers of capital punishment for the sake of defending the faith, or seculars who refused not to run the risk of their lives and fortunes, lest they should be entirely deprived of the helps to piety which the sacraments offered them; such was, and is to this day, the singular goodness of God towards this once most religious nation.

"(1) And to come to those of the Society who led a private life. They for the most part lived in the upper storeys or attics of the house, as remote as possible from the observation of domestics and visitors. The same room contained altar, table, and bed. Great caution had to be observed with the windows, whether to admit or exclude light; by day they were most careful in opening them, lest the passers-by might observe that someone lived in the room; at night they were more careful still in shutting them, lest the light might betray the inhabitants. Walking about the room had to be done very lightly or else cautiously along some beam. At certain hours all movement in the room was prohibited, that no noise might be heard either in the room adjoining or in the one beneath. They were not permitted to go about the house except to a neighbouring room, and that with caution. But if they left the house either for the sake of charity or for health's sake or on their own business or that of others, they had to go out at the second or third hour of the night, and return either when the domestics were at supper or else retired to rest. For there were heretics among these; and although the master of the house did not wholly distrust them, since they were his servants and under many obligations to him, yet he did not so far trust them as to feel sure that they might not attest they had seen or at least knew a priest to be in the house, nor did he consider that even Catholic servants should be too much trusted. Whence it happened that in a very numerous family of sixty or eighty persons, a priest spent almost days weeks, and months entirely alone; for, except the hour of Mass

at which some of the household at least were always present, and a short space of time before and after Mass, the rest of the day everyone spent in his own or other's business, or in different country recreations. A female servant brought in his dinner and supper, and then left immediately. He ate and took recreation alone, unless the servant happened to return after the meal, with perhaps one of the boys or girls of the family; or the lady of the house might look in and apologise for not having been able to pay him a visit sooner.

"How oppressive this constant solitude was to those accustomed to habits of conversation and reading, no one can imagine who has not tried it, especially since they were deprived of the consolation which frequent confession or the very sight and intercourse with their brethren or variety in occupation usually affords. For, except when the Superior visited them, they scarcely ever saw one of the Society, or any other priest in the house; as they were but seldom allowed to go out of doors, and this only at intervals of months.

"(2) Others who, travelling in different localities either on foot or horseback, assisted the Catholics or brought wanderers back to the faith, had for the most part at least one house in which they could remain for some days to recruit themselves; so that the surrounding Catholics were able to learn where a priest could be procured, if the needs of the dying or the administration of baptism required it. As for the rest, they were perpetually moving about, visiting and administering consolation. In the evening, after dinner, they entered the house, either openly or privately, as circumstances would permit, and departed the next day. Very often by a change of dress and name, or of the direction in which they were going, or by other schemes, they managed to deceive, as long as possible, those whose notice they had to escape. The chief part of the harvest fell naturally to these active men, who thus met with and seized upon every opportunity of disseminating truth and virtue, whether by themselves or others. They were exposed to special dangers; but by the more frequent opportunity of meeting their Superior and others of the Society, and by reaping at once the fruit of their labours, their very distractions tended to increase piety; and after their communica-

tions with others, they returned all the more eagerly to retirement so as to increase their spiritual advancement.

"(3) The third mode of living left others free to converse either at home or abroad. For the head of the house in which they lived was made, either by his own position or by the good esteem of his neighbours, superior, as it were, to the action of the laws. Though such men did not despise the laws by living without any caution, yet they did not deem it necessary to live in such servile fear as though the liberty either of the priest or of themselves was likely to suffer. They engaged for the most part Catholic servants, who did everything within the house in a Catholic spirit. If any storm burst out, they were warned of it by certain parties, and the absence of the priest for a few days, or his concealment for some hours, restored liberty to them for the rest of the time. Among such our superiors commonly lived, that they might be at liberty to visit the members of the Society when requisite or to summon them to the house where they were. And by these, as possessing the greater means of intercourse with others, the chief part of the harvest was gathered in.

"But the face of affairs is now entirely changed. Scarcely one in the whole kingdom is found who can furnish the means of living after this third mode, though they were formerly numerous enough. Those who go forth to assist others in different places are forced to spend their nights travelling and their days in helping the Catholics at home. Many are reduced to the first mode of living; they 'sit like sparrows upon the house-top expecting the happy day, and the advent of the glory of the great God'; for, humanly speaking, very little is hoped for, whichever side of the conflicting parties prevail."[1]

But the superiors kept a sharp eye upon the situation. While Parsons in Rome, as we shall see in the next chapter, was making a final effort to reassert his supremacy, Fr. Robert Jones, the Superior in England, in spite of the papal prohibition, took advantage of the disputes about the Oath of Allegiance to bring back the Archpriest into the course of advising with the Jesuits about the concerns of his office. The

[1] Foley, vol. ii. p. 3 *et seq.*

late is 23rd June 1610, about two months after Parsons' leath.

"1610.

"MOST REVEREND SIR,—Although I cannot doubt of your are and vigilance in maintaining and defending all that oncerns the integrity and purity of our holy faith, neverthe-ess out of regard for the reverence I owe to the eternal verity f God, and for the love I bear to your Reverence and to all f yours, I hold myself obliged to warn you of all these isturbances that may arise to the damage of the common ause and to the prejudice of the Clergy.

"The fact is, many Catholics, alarmed at the edict lately ublished, show themselves to be vacillating in that which hey at first judged illegal, and intend to admit the Oath ondemned by His Holiness, and declared to be contrary o our wholesome faith. And to hide their weakness and railty they wish to defend themselves with the authority f the directors of their consciences, saying that they do ot doubt that many, if not the greater part of the more earned and grave among the Clergy, approve of the Oath, vhich indeed (as I hope and believe) will never come true. Nevertheless, to prevent the danger, and to the end that we lo not go on in this offensive mode of proceeding, I deem it lue to charity to warn your reverend assistants and all others hat your prudence will judge it expedient to take advice in his affair, being of such great importance, so that with true eal for the Divine glory and by a strict observance of an postolical precept so weighty, we may the more speedily vert from us the anger of God and hasten His mercy towards s. As nothing else occurs to me at present, I conclude with espects to the illustrious Lord Viscount your patron, whom I enderly love in the bowels of the sweet Jesus."[1]

We must now go back to Italy, and watch Parsons' last fforts on behalf of his Society.

[1] From the Jesuit Archives in Rome. See Foley, vol. viii. p. 1370.

CHAPTER XIII

A LIFE'S TRAGEDY

It was not to be expected that the English Clergy would remain content under the economy with which Parsons had provided them. They had a lively sense of their own sufferings; and the presence of the Archpriest in their midst was a monument of a successful opponent. Early in May 1606, Champney and Cecil, two of the former appellants, set out for Rome on another appeal. One might have thought that as the political end for which the Archpriest was instituted had failed, the Jesuits would have been glad of this opportunity to meet the Clergy half-way, and join with them in obtaining the restoration of ordinary episcopal rule. That Parsons did not do so is a proof that secular politics were not his only aim. He was working for the independence of the Jesuits in England. Over these the Archpriest had no control. "To revert now to an episcopal form of government would have the effect of curtailing this independence. It would place the Jesuits as well as the other regulars under the control of the canons, and would thus materially affect their position and their influence among the Catholics of England."[1]

When the envoys arrived, some time before 26th May 1606, they again kept away from the English college. Parsons at once resumed his old tactics of writing memorials to attack their credit. He did all he could to hinder them from having access to the Pope. He supplied the Archpriest's agents with a memorial[2] (26th May) containing accusations

[1] Dodd's *Church History of England* (ed. Tierney), vol. v. p. 10.

[2] One of the charges against Cecil was his intimacy with the Government. The charge, so far as it goes, is true. But, on the other hand, one must remember how strenuously Parsons had tried to ingratiate himself with that same heretical Government. As he had failed, it was a crime for anyone else to succeed.

against both of them, and asking the Pope to order Cecil to be taken prisoner, and made to answer the crimes that were imputed to him.[1] In his own name, Parsons presented another, which was a reproduction of the violent and unscrupulous memorial presented against the other envoys. "But an interval of four years, if it had sharpened the invention had certainly not improved the memory of the writer. In the earlier paper he had generally confined himself to a succinct relation of supposed facts; in the later memorial he becomes more discursive; throws in an occasional embellishment which had not previously occurred to him; and then perhaps adds a date or a circumstance which at once destroys the whole credibility of his narrative."[2]

As Cecil and Champney kept away from him, Parsons tried again to make friends with them. He wrote a long letter on 16th July, regretting that none of his offers of service, made so often by messengers, had resulted in the two coming to talk matters over with him or frequenting his company or even visiting the college chapel. He writes, he says, being moved by the word of our Lord, which orders us to forgive a brother seventy times seven. He complains that when they were in Rome four years ago they had kept aloof from him, in spite of all his endeavours to the contrary. Then they pleaded that it were better to wait till the cause had been decided; and when that was done they made other excuses. But now such excuses do not avail; for although he had sent letters after them to Paris in 1603, to the effect that, as all had been settled by the Pope, they should return to their old relations, he had received no answer, and his efforts in the way of peace were greeted with derision.[3] He understands

[1] The rough draft in Parsons' handwriting is kept at Stonyhurst.

[2] *Tierney*, vol. v. p. xv., note.

[3] Parsons in the letter of 1st January 1603, to which he refers, expresses disappointment that the deputies had rejected his overtures for an interview. But in the memorial which Parsons drew up in Italian against the present deputies, and in which he repeats the former calumnies with enlargements, the same fact is mentioned as a special ground of accusation against him, and in this letter it is again mentioned. "Will it be believed," says Tierney, "that only a short time after, this very man could write to his friends in Flanders declaring that the deputies had solicited and that he had refused the interview?" This is not the only discrepancy in the accounts.

that they were attributed to fear; but the only thing he feared was the Last Judgment. He then says he is not conscious of having ever given them any cause of dissension; and piously hopes that God will not impute to him any of the scandals that daily arise therefrom, but will regard the sorrow he feels on their account. But they (the deputies) ought to consider that they are keeping up for so many years a feud which has been reprobated by so many papal decrees. One thing at least ought to move them, namely, the King and his Council have publicly stated that these dissensions are useful to them and are to be promoted.[1]

Parsons was, however, powerful enough to get the appeal once more dismissed. The Archpriest was continued in office, and the question of bishops was again shelved. But his intentions towards Dr. Cecil were not crowned with success.

The General of the Jesuits, Aquaviva, about this time (15th May 1606) gave Parsons a letter on the Office and Rules for the Prefect of the Mission. When he had been appointed Rector of the English college, Parsons was given by the General authority over all, with the title of Prefect of the English Mission; "which prefecture," says the Jesuit historian More, "regards the Society itself chiefly and its subjects in the seminaries and in England and the English in the various colleges, and thence from them, as far as can be conveniently

[1] *Tierney*, vol. v. pp. xvii–xx. Upon this letter, which one would fain attribute to failing mental power, Tierney makes the following pregnant remarks: "Again I must repeat, that painful as it is to contemplate these continual violations of truth and justice and honesty, and more especially to see them united, as in the present letter, with such earnest professions of charity and religion; still the rancour with which the characters of many of the appellants are even yet pursued by a certain class of writers, renders it imperative to expose the real value of the principal, if not of the only original testimony against them. Let me add that nothing can be more just, nothing more forcible, than many of Parsons' exhortations to union. But the misfortune was, that he overlooked his own position and his own duties; he contented himself with exhorting others to peace, instead of establishing it by his own example; and whilst in the tone of a master he was commanding the waters to be still, he forgot—or appeared to forget—that he was himself exciting the tempest by which they were agitated. 'Only Father Parsons do guide' was the complaint even of a Jesuit (Creighton); and the exclusive power of government had become so habitual with him that the words union, charity, and religion seemed to have conveyed no other meaning to his mind than that of blind submission to his will" (*Tierney*, vol. v. pp. xviii–xix., note).

one, the others, whether they be in the seminaries or labouring n England."[1]

Though there were now about forty Jesuits in England, and nany others in Rome, Spain, and Flanders, they were not yet rganised into a Province, although by the aid of benefactors ome permanent provision had been made for them at Louvain. t was thought advisable to set down rules for the Prefect of he Mission, that his rights might be clearly understood. This locument More has printed *in extenso*, that posterity may dmire "the union of minds and the prudence with which or so many years such a great matter has been administered."[2] The title runs thus: "The Office and Rules of the Prefect of he Missions, for the direction of the Mission of the Society, nd also for helping the English seminaries which are under he government of the Society." The rules seem to ignore he existence of any other mission to England save that of he Jesuits. The Prefect of the Mission, as a quasi-provincial, s made independent of local superiors as far as his govern- nent is concerned, although he has to consult with them. He has jurisdiction over all the English houses wherever they nay be, and also over the men engaged on the Mission; but he s not to interfere in the ordinary government of the rectors, vhich has to be preserved. They, on the other hand, are not o do anything of importance without consulting him. He nas the right of admitting or discharging any student, or of emoving him to another seminary, for sake of the student's ealth or any other cause. . . . He controls the course of tudies. Certain rules are laid down for preserving mutual eace between the various seminaries. The Prefect is to have lso the practical control over the expenditure of all the stablishments. As the seminaries and the whole of the English cause especially depend upon the royal favour, and as ecourse has often to be made to the Court, the Prefect has to ppoint procurators at Madrid and Brussels. The expenses of hese agents and those which the Prefect himself incurs, whether hey be for his personal needs, or for journeys, or for letters,[3]

[1] More, p. 240. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] This will explain how Parsons was able to carry on so extensive a correspondence.

as they are for the common good of the seminaries, so they are to be met by these institutions. One clause is worth noticing, as it explains certain complaints made against Parsons: "For this cause it will be lawful to the Prefect, out of the alms he may have himself procured or by others, to give money sometimes to needy Catholic wayfarers according as shall seem expedient in conscience. And when extraordinary alms are not forthcoming he can take from the common income of the seminaries for such purposes as, the journey money for the fathers going into England or called from Flanders, Italy, and other places; for everything belongs to the common good of defending the cause; and to these general uses he can sometimes set aside certain moneys, or keep by him or distribute them according to his judgment, especially such alms as were left to his will by the donors."

This document contains no reference to the Archpriest, nor to the relations to be cultivated by the Prefect and his subjects with the Clergy in England. It simply details his power and relations with local superiors. Perhaps we may find a reason for it in the troubles Parsons was then having in Spain with Fr. Creswell.

It will be remembered that, on appeal, Blackwell had been forbidden to communicate with the Jesuits on the concerns of his office. This prohibition had given great umbrage to Parsons. He seized the opportunity of the appointment of George Birkhead, by his recommendation, in 1608, to invite his confidences upon all matters. But as the Clergy had already extracted a promise from the new Archpriest that he would abide by the Pope's orders, doubts were suggested to him that the law did not bind in his case. "A wish to employ the counsel of the fathers soon produced a doubt of its illegality; and to satisfy his mind upon the subject, he wrote to Parsons stating his desires and his difficulties, and requesting to know whether the restrictions imposed upon his predecessors were equally binding upon him. Parsons saw that the opportunity had now arrived for which he had been long waiting. In a letter filled with expressions of the warmest attachment to his correspondent, he promised to lay the matter before the Pope, and in due season to acquaint him

with the result. In the meantime, however, he exhorted him to dismiss his scruples; assured him that by consulting the fathers in the affairs of his office he would contravene neither the intentions of the late nor the wishes of the present Pontiff; and finally engaged that if by his conduct he would prove himself a constant adherent of the Society the latter would employ the whole weight of its influence and of its means to support him against the efforts of his opponents."[1]

Having his conscience thus settled for him, Birkhead began a correspondence with Parsons, and consulted the Superior in England. All his official correspondence passed through Parsons' hands, who delivered or suppressed it as he chose.[2] Thomas Fitzherbert, who was, I believe, under vow to Parsons, and ultimately joined the Society, was the nominal agent in Rome for the Archpriest; but as he relied on the Jesuit for every detail, Parsons had full control, and pulled all the strings which worked the puppet. This became known to the Clergy, who were indignant at the breach of faith. Mush writes to Cardinal Arrigoni (30th January 1609) "that Parsons had ordered the Archpriest to send all letters destined for His Holiness or the Protector, unsealed and open, to himself or his Fitzherbert, 'as a little boy would to his schoolmaster.'"[3] Even before this, the Clergy had begun to remonstrate with him, and in answer to this Parsons wrote the following letter, which, in view of all we know, is a most extraordinary production. It was written evidently to be seen by the Clergy:—

[4] "MOST REVEREND SIR,—I am very desirous if it may

[1] Dodd (ed. Tierney), vol. v. p. 14.

[2] As an example, the case of Lord Montague is at hand. In 1606 he forwarded to the Pope a letter on the question of appointing bishops. Parsons, through whose hands the paper passed, opened and suppressed it. "Wherein," he writes, two years after, when Montague found out the truth, "I do assure you, upon my conscience, I proceeded with as great a desire to serve him, and to do that which I presumed himself would have commanded to be done, if he had been present, as possibly I could. . . . If I presumed overmuch of his approbation, it proceeded out of too much respect, and shall be amended, God willing, by punctually doing his prescribed will, without any επικεια on my part, etc." Parsons to Birkhead 18th May 1608), *Tierney*, vol. v. p. xxvii.

[3] *Archpriest Controversy*, ii. pp. xxviii, xxix.

[4] To Birkhead, 4th October 1608.

be to give you and your brethren these satisfactions, so far a
is reason, that I do neither meddle with their affairs, nor desir
it, nor ever did pretend to have the least jot of authority ove
the least priest in England, and much less over any of them
that are of a more principal rank. My dealing is with thos
of our own order, committed to my charge, whom I have als
expressly admonished to allow to their own affairs in God'
service *et pacem habere cum omnibus quantum fieri potes*
And truly, I wonder that your said brethren that are s
earnest with you to break off all friendly correspondence wit
us here, what good end they can have in conscience an
prudence for the same, if it be not continual increase o
further dissension and disfriendship amongst us. . . . An
it seems here to wise men the strangest point in the worl
and to savour of strong passion, that I, professing as I do
that neither I have, nor desire to have, any part in th
managing of their affairs, as both His Holiness and th
College of Cardinals, by whose hands English affairs do pass
do well know and testify with me, yet they will not eithe
cease to demand that I meddle not, nor show some particular
wherein I do meddle. And in very deed, no man is so simpl
but seeth that the accusation falleth rather upon His Holiness
whom they falsely suppose and give out to be ruled by me
than upon myself, only it seemeth they would have me t
have neither eyes nor ears nor tongue to see, hear, and speak
nor subsistence in this place, and would annihilate me from
the face of the earth; which lieth not in their power, though
their passion be never so strong; but here I must live whil
obedience doth appoint it so; where I shall be ready to serv
my country, and them also if they will use me. Neither may
I hold my peace if His Holiness demand my opinion, nor wer
it reason; though I do fly most willingly all occasion to speak
a deal in any matter that concerneth them or theirs, and i
this will not conserve peace and friendship among us I know
no other means of remedy but patience and perseverance which
finally will overcome all. And so much I pray you let them
know from me in Christian love, with my commendations t
every one, whereof, I suppose, there be few to whom I hav
not sought to do pleasure and service and never to hur

them: and my opinion is that they hurt themselves more both before God and men with their manner of animosity against their friend that laboureth in the same cause of God's service with them, than is needful here to be repeated. And so much of this.

"Now, sir, to come to some particulars. After I had given my opinion (being demanded) in favour of bishops, which was in effect to refer the matter back to England again as has been signified, I was called by Cardinal Blanchetti and commanded, in the name of His Holiness, to write the answer into England both in that point and in the point of two or three new forms of oaths which have been sent to His Holiness; but I desired the Cardinal to reply unto His Holiness and the Congregation of Cardinals of the Inquisition from whom the order came, that albeit I might write it to our fathers, of whom I had charge, yet I desired them to pardon me for writing it to you, for that it might offend others: whereupon new order was taken that it should be written by the Cardinal to the aforesaid Nuncio in France and Flanders, from whom, no doubt, you will hear the particulars; and I make account that Mr. Fitzherbert will inform you also thereof more largely: so that by this you may see I do shake off, as much as I can, all occasion of meddling or having to do in your said brethren's affairs as they account them; and all for the love of peace, if it may be had. And you should do me great pleasure in sparing to impart anything of theirs unto me which you may dispatch by other means, though I shall never be weary to serve you wherein I may, notwithstanding any contradiction whatsoever either of theirs or others, etc."[1]

In spite of Parsons' refusal to write the news, he did write it; and, what is more, he had already written it to Birkhead fourteen days before; and, moreover, he had written it, as he said, on the authority of the Pope. In a secret letter, written 4th September 1608 to the very man he is now calmly telling he had refused to write the news, he says: "His Holiness's answer to the three forms of a new oath is that he disliketh them all or any other whatever that directly or indirectly may

[1] *Tierney*, vol. v. pp. xlix–li.

concern the authority of the See Apostolic; and he wondereth much that you were (not) backward in them all. . . . And as for the bishops, his answer was that he is willing to make them if he may be certified that it is a *general* desire of *all*, and that *by the same consent* some fit men be represented unto him."[1]

By a letter written 4th October by Fitzherbert, Parsons's humble servant and the Archpriest's nominal agent, we learn that the decision of the Pope's, which Parsons reports on 4th September, was not taken until 18th September. In the view of all this, if we were to blot out of our memory all the other cases of subtlety which have so plentifully abounded in the course of this narrative, we should have sufficient cause for distrusting any statement which comes to us on the unsupported testimony of Robert Parsons.

The assurance made by the Jesuit concerning the intention and wishes of the Pope in the matter of consulting the fathers in England, was eventually found by Birkhead to rest solely on Parsons' word. In fact, when the matter was formally proposed to the Pope, he at once said the prohibition was as binding on Birkhead as on Blackwell. The Archpriest began, in the spring of 1609, to feel distrustful of the one who had made himself his guide, philosopher, and friend. Under these circumstances, Birkhead listened more favourably to the remonstrances of the Clergy; and finding it was their general wish to have episcopal superiors, he joined at last with them and sent an envoy—Dr. Smith—to Rome to carry on the business in his name. "Partly from a lingering confidence in his friends, and partly from a fear that by setting them aside, he might possibly offend the Pope, Birkhead wished to entrust the whole management of the negotiation to Parsons and Fitzherbert. The Clergy, on the other hand, demurred to this arrangement. . . . Birkhead compromised matters by agreeing to send Smith and binding him to consult Parsons and Fitzherbert."[2]

The following extracts from Parsons' correspondence with the Archpriest at this date are illustrative:—

[3] "I do not doubt but that you shall find all my friends

[1] *Tierney*, vol. v. p. xlii.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 17, note.

[3] To Birkhead, 31st May 1608.

to be faithfully yours in all occasions; which Signor Paul (the Pope) doth greatly also work; and, for that respect, was the former clause left out of restraint which was procured by the clamour and importunity of some, as you know, and caused some strangeness between them and your predecessors. . . . If you can by any good means, as before I have said, pleasure and win them that have been unquiet, you shall do well therein, and we shall concur therein with you, but in this you must bear yourself as a superior; indifferent to use them or others for the good of the common cause; and they must not think to prescribe unto you whom you must use and whom not, or that for their sakes you must change your former judgment or affection in the said cause, or leave your old tried friends for their brittle friendship if it be not founded in the same cause and form united course thereof . . ."[1]

Concerning his action in the ever-recurring question of bishops, Parsons writes (21st June 1608):

"As for them that lay all upon your friend here (R. P.), they do him much wrong; for that he abstained from dealing in their affairs whatsoever he could,[2] but only to pray for them: yet being in the place he is, when he is asked his opinion, he cannot but speak it, with his reasons for the same; and this also for so much as concerneth only the public; wherein he cannot but think he hath as much interest as another to speak his mind: and those that are or will be angry for this must have patience with him as he hath with them: for as he thinketh himself to have laboured as much as another, so is his desire no less to do what good he can, and this without offence of others if it may be; if not he may not leave to do good for not offending them that would let or hinder the same."[3]

And on the same subject to Birkhead (5th July 1608): "And as to my aversion therein, God seeth that I am no less wronged therein than in many other reports which I leave as only accountable to Him. The simple truth is that I never

[1] *Tierney*, vol. v. pp. xxix–xxxi.

[2] The reader, knowing that Parsons drew up all the memorials against the Clergy, and led the case, will be able to appreciate the truth of this statement.

[3] *Tierney*, vol. v. p. xxxii.

averted from it, but always did see so many reasons for it; and as well in Cardinal Allen's time as since, at several times have caused my petitions and motives to be made for the same."[1]

In *an ostensible letter* to Birkhead (21st August 1608), Parsons discusses the question of prohibiting communication with the Jesuits: "Paul expounded his meaning to be, and this by Cardinal Farnesius to Mr. Blackwell, as I suppose you have heard, that the prohibition was to be understood only of treating together matters of State, or that might justly offend the State; and therefore when you were appointed to be his successor, the Breve was made according to the first institution of Cardinal Cajetan before the said restrictions were made or thought of."[2] Parsons knew this was not true. Farnese's words are: "The clause is to be taken in the sense that while you may confer with the fathers upon all things for your aid and consolation which appertains to the Catholic faith, cases of conscience and spiritual things, yet concerning the government of your subjects, politics, and of the State, it is not lawful to impart anything to the fathers, etc."[3]

With this came *a secret letter* (23rd August 1608): "This I write to you alone, to the end you may show the others to your brethren there that press you so much, if you think it expedient: for by that answer it may be they shall see that you have prepared their affairs *efficaciter*. But, indeed, you must reserve yourself superior as well of theirs as of other men's demands and reasons, but not fear overmuch any man's prayers and importunities: for otherwise, you will be carried down the river before you see it, and so gone into great diffidence with others who, in our judgments and in that of His Holiness also, I doubt not, but do seem the better and quieter part."[4]

Seeing the policy of delay, he writes (13th September 1608) to stave off the coming of Dr. Smith, and warns the Archpriest

"For wrestling here, if any such wrestlers come here they

[1] *Tierney*, vol. v. p. xxxiii. This is true so far, but he conceals two important points: first, his bishops were not to be ordinaries; secondly, that he gave up the idea even of these for the Archpriest.

[2] P. xxxix.

[3] Farnese to Blackwell (10th February 1607). From a copy endorsed by Parsons

[4] P. xl.

may worse weary themselves than hurt other men; for that Rome is a large stable wherein a horse may outlabour himself in kicking and winching without striking others that will keep themselves far enough from them and have nothing to do with but stand upon their own defence." [1]

Parsons had done all he could to prevent Smith's coming. He urged that the good Fitzherbert was equal to anything. But when Smith did come, Parsons lost no occasion of secretly defaming him to the Archpriest, although in letters, written to be shown, he speaks warmly of the envoy. This dealing is exhibited in the following letters:—

Parsons to Birkhead (6th June 1609). *An ostensible letter.*

"MOST REVEREND AND WORSHIPFUL SIR,—To yours of the twenty-seventh of February I answered upon the second of May, signifying how willing Mr. Dr. Smith, your agent, should find me at his coming to comfort, help, and pleasure him in what I might according to your desire; and so I think he finds it in effect, arriving here one week or thereabout after the writing of my said letter, whom I received here most willingly in the college, together with his companion, Mr. More; and gave them both the most kindest entertainment I could for the space of the eight days that they remained; inviting them to stay longer, even so long as we should have any room which now is much straitened by the multitude of people which we have for the present.

"During the time of their abode, Mr. Doctor imparted with me divers writings of yours, but namely your commission, your instructions for explication of your mind and meaning in this his commission, and then the points to be treated, whereof the first was for you to be bound not to deal with us and any of ours in matters of your government;[2] wherein he was very anxious to have my consent, as in the matter, he said, of

[1] P. xlv.

[2] Tierney remarks on this: "It was not an application to be 'bound' as here set forth, but a request to be informed *how far* the existing Breve of Pope Clement was obligatory. . . . Parsons, who had persuaded Birkhead that the force of the Breve had expired, was of course anxious not to appear to have deceived him; and hence the present misrepresentation occurs in every instance in which either he or Fitzherbert alludes to the subject" (p. xlii, note).

greatest importance for the peace desired; and it would be taken there very kindly if we of the Society granted thereunto. I answered that I found no difficulty in our behalf, especially if you were content to be bound: but yet, for that Father General was forth of town, and that you writ in your instructions this clause, that he and I should deal together *si sanctissimo placuerit*, I could not well enter into that treatise except that either Father General were come home, or that a word were spoken to the Pope in the first audience that he and Mr. Fitzherbert should have together with His Holiness, that he would be content that we should treat this and other points among ourselves first according to your desire . . . Mr. Dr. Smith in nowise would consent to this, but would needs have the first point at least proposed in the first audience; whereunto finally I gave my consent for so much as touch the Society, as did also Father General at his first coming home;[1] and so they have their audience, as I doubt not but that both they and Mr. Swinnerton (*Fitzherbert*) have written unto you. And for so much as they told His Holiness that Father General and I did willingly for the sake of peace *cedere de jure nostro*, His Holiness did without difficulty transplace the obligation of the last Archpriest upon yourself, with this interpretation that the prohibition should be only *quoad dispositionem subditorum et materias status*; but in the matter of doctrine, cases of conscience, or spiritual affairs, you should be free to deal with whom you would, which is the very same interpretation which His Holiness had given before, by Cardinal Farnesius to the last Archpriest: and so I trust that about this there will be no more matter of contention or falling out."[2]

[1] "The reader will naturally inquire how the return or the consent of the General could affect a question which turned, as Parsons pretended, on the approbation of the Pope? The truth, however, clearly is, that the reference to the Pope's pleasure, if it was really made, was but a protest; the real motive of the refusal to discuss Smith's propositions was a wish to prevent their being admitted to the papal notice. Hence, as soon as the General had signified his approval of the matters to be propounded, the pleasure or displeasure of the Pope seems to have been entirely forgotten, and Parsons, without further difficulty, proceeded at once to debate the very points for whose discussion, if we may believe himself, he had previously required the permission of the Pope" (*Tierney*, based on Smith's MS., p. lxii).

[2] *Tierney*, vol. v. pp. lxii–lxiv. On referring, however, to Smith's memorial presented to the Pope (24th May 1609, *Tierney*, vol. v. p. lxi), we do not find any

Together with this letter comes a secret one, written on the same day,[1] saying: "Our old love requireth that I should confidently let you know some particulars apart, which if you like to read and understand them I impose upon you the obligation of secrecy: which if you like not, then do not read the same, but presently burn the letter; and if you read it, then mind you remain bound to impart with none, except it be with the superior of our fathers there or with some others of his company with his liking." And this in spite of the recent prohibition! He proceeds in this secret letter to undo much of what he had written in the "ostensible" one, and does not refrain from renewed insinuations to undermine the Archpriest's confidence in Smith's personal loyalty. Parsons tells him that the Jesuits are his best friends, and that: "I have borne myself towards them (I mean your agent and his companion) as though I had been their scholar, and they had brought me up, and not I them; and as if they were ancient men in this Court and knew all things that were to be done, and I were young and knew nothing; which was needful if any peace were to be held: for truly upon my conscience I never dealt with any men in my life more heady and resolute in their opinions than is this doctor whom the other in all things secondeth."[2]

In the following letter a light is thrown upon an attempt Parsons was making to give the impression that Smith was holding heretical opinions. Strange to reflect, by the way, that two of the men who at various periods were envoys in Rome on behalf of the Clergy, and were wantonly accused by

trace of such a statement, that the General and Parsons had ceded their rights "of interfering in the government of the English Clergy. What the envoy did say was that the Jesuits themselves had judged that the former prohibition was expedient for the common good and peace in England." It therefore follows that the Pope's decision was not based upon the statement Parsons asserts, but on wholly different reasons. It neither is the fact that the Pope "transplaced the obligation of the last Archpriest upon" Birkhead. In the official letters written by Cardinal Blanchetti (6th June 1609, *Tierney*, p. lxv), the Pope orders that the prohibition directed to Blackwell bind all his successors, and that he believes that it will be much to the peace and quiet of the Realm if, as far as the administration and ruling of the English Church is concerned, the services of the Jesuits are not employed.

[1] See also the "ostensible letter" and the "secret letters" of 4th July and that of 25th July, in *Tierney*, pp. lxix–lxxiv.

[2] *Tierney*, vol. v. pp. lxvi–lxviii.

Parsons, should have been a few years later nominated bishops by the Holy See.

Parsons to Birkhead. *A secret letter* (15th September 1609).

"He (Smith) hath been over-liberal in talk here to divers, especially about his opinion that it is not *de fide quod papa ullam habeat auctoritatem deponendi principes*, and he hath defended the same before others, and also told how Mr. Blackwell and he jarred about that point . . . which here soundeth not well . . . as also that other opinion of his that there is no true Catholic Church now in England so long as they have no bishop, which as, in rigour of speech cannot be defended, so seemeth it to involve a great reprehension of the See Apostolic so long to have suffered a want of bishops in England. . . . But we, your friends, do mitigate that, and answer for you when occasion is offered that what you do, you do to good purpose, and cannot do well otherwise as matters stand, and that your mind and intention is sincere; and so really we persuade ourselves to be the very truth."[1]

When the prohibition was confirmed, Parsons found a way out of it.

"Albeit I perceive by your late letter written to Mr. Fitzherbert, and otherwise, that you esteem yourself bound to have less intention with me and mine than heretofore, in respect of the late orders procured from hence by your agent, yet I do not think that I am any way restrained from writing or dealing with you thereby; nor you any otherwise with me or mine, than in case of government of your subjects."[2]

In reply to which Birkhead pertinently replies (8th January 1610):

"Will your reverence have my poor opinion what may help much in this matter of uniting us in peace? Let your company and friends that be there show on their countenances as much alacrity for the order which His Holiness hath taken concerning our government as I and mine have done; and I would not doubt that it would be a great provocation to con-

[1] P. lxxvi. [2] P. lxxxv.

fidence, peace, and concord amongst us. . . . If you object against my agent things that are true, I cannot but take it in good part; but if you seek to oppress him by false informations, I must bend myself, in all due respect to your gravity and years, to defend him as well as I can, if he give me no cause to the contrary."[1]

Birkhead, at last finding that Fitzherbert, acting by Parsons' instructions, was thwarting all his agent was doing, removed the former from his agency, and released Smith from all obligation of consulting with them.[2] This caused a vast amount of displeasure to Parsons, and a breach ensued,[3] which was ultimately patched up, upon which Parsons writes to Birkhead (6th March 1610):

"Your agent hath been here of late with me, and we have treated generally of all matters and renewed our old friendship, and *as I never to my knowledge gave him cause of alienation* or breach from us, so was the reconciliation easy, and

[1] P. xc. Birkhead writes to the Protector (23rd February 1610): "It has come to me from certain sources that some of the Clergy so closely and in a hidden manner adhere to the reverend fathers, that although outwardly they profess themselves subject to me, yet give secretly and inwardly obedience to them and do all according to their wills (*Omnemque suam operam impendant*" (p. xcii); and complains that his agent is accused of heresy.

[2] 3rd October 1609. "Considering his said Holiness's full intention (the prohibition) to be for the maintenance of peace, and that I cannot satisfy his expectation nor preserve the said peace unless my good friend, Mr. Thomas Fitzherbert, be also removed from meddling with you in our affairs, I therefore am forced to impose upon your shoulders the whole burden of my agency. Wherefore I would have you signify unto my said friend, Mr. Thomas Fitzherbert, in my name that, at the first, because I took it to be a thing not inconvenient to my office and charge, and withal finding all things in tumult and hurly-burly, not only my Clergy being at difference among themselves, but also at some variance between many of them and some of the fathers of the Society, having been invited at the first by Father Parsons to entreat his pains when I had no man else there to supply his room, I thought it meet to use him also, as joined with you, my agent, to propose our affairs to the See Apostolic. But now through the assistance of Almighty God, having brought my own company to a firm peace with me and amongst themselves, and not only ready to forget all disgusts past, but also to join in all amity with them of the Society so they intermeddle not with our government, I shall hereafter have no cause to trouble him as heretofore; but am rather compelled to the contrary by the determination of His Holiness" (p. lxxx).

[3] "My old friend (Parsons) is exceeding jealous, but I trust he will be wiser ere he have done. . . . I would my old friend were here amongst us to hear the cries that we do hear; and then I trust he would believe them better than those that write the contrary" (p. lxxxii).

shall be continued of my part with all true affection towards you."[1]

The following is the last letter of the series, and was written three weeks before Parsons' death:—

Parsons to Birkhead, 20th March 1610.

"MOST REVEREND SIR,—I have been very glad by yours of the month of January to understand of your good health . . . though we cannot be but very sorry to understand that you are so wrongfully informed in many matters as you show to be; and so much the more for that though we see the great many inconveniences thereof both to you and to us, yet we do not see any easy way of remedy, for, as by seeing through a glass the colours must needs appear such as the glass hath in it, and the water must needs taste of the scents wherewith the channel is imbued by which it passeth, so you, taking your information from one (*Smith*) that showed himself preoccupied with humours quite opposite unto all true peace and confidence between us, you can hardly avoid the receiving of such impressions as he layeth upon you, which, I fear me, you will see when it is too late to remedy. It was both our and your evil hap when you lighted upon such a mediator who showeth himself so passionate and captious as even in private talk he will often mistake a man's word so as presently he is bound to justify himself; and much more afterwards will misreport or misconstrue them; which I am sorry to be forced to tell you; but this is the truth that hath passed with myself;—others I have heard complain of the same, but that I leave to them.

"I hope you persuade yourself that I knew in part at least what a great sin it is to misreport any man or hurt his fame wrongfully; and the interest I may have to seek your satisfaction is not such as I would in this my old age endamage my conscience for the same; yet do I assure you, on the word of a priest and religious man, that some things which you repeat be very untruly informed unto you. For first, *I never said in*

[1] The Pope had made this request to Smith. Birkhead to Smith (23rd April 1610): "I was content to send my letter now by the way of my old friend for mine increase of friendship between you and him, whom I like very well and am glad you have already madest; and so much the more *as His Holiness hath vouchsafed to crave it at your hands.*"

my life that any articles of yours, or as they came from you, were of opposition or animosity, but always defended your pious meaning, though your agent's *manner* of proposing and urging some of them might savour of opposition and animosity, not being capable to follow any counsel therein. And this I remember that once or twice I told him, and he presently, as his fashion was, would lay all upon you and say it was by your order, and that by this I noted you of opposition and animosity. I denied the same as before hath been said, telling him that it was his *manner* of proceeding that offended, and that you and we should easily agree if we might deal together and he would follow the direction he brought from you.[1] And about these points was principally our contention, for some time, at the beginning, but when I saw it profited not, I left off; permitting him to himself, assuring myself notwithstanding that whatsoever he should not effectuate to his will he would ascribe to my contradiction and thereby excuse himself with you there; which being behind, every man seeth what likelihood there is of peace and concord by his means among us.

"I have examined also the other point which you write, that one of ours here, that never knew you, should say that your said articles did proceed of a wicked and diabolical spirit; and I find that the man, as he is wise, sober, and religious, and both loveth and esteemeth you greatly, so he protesteth in his conscience that never in his life did he say or think so of you; but well remembereth that, reasoning with your agent about the staying of the missions[2] of the seminaries, did expressly profess that he doubted not but that your intention was good and lawful, and so he would think of your agent also, but yet that the effect would be very prejudicial to the

[1] And yet Parsons had already written to Birkhead (25th July 1609) saying: "And heartily I could wish there were more familiarity and confidence and more communication in affairs. I have offered them to concur in all things that in reason and conscience I may: and I would have them to propose rather some profitable things to the common cause and such as might not have *speciem oppositionis vel animositatis*" (*Tierney*, vol. v. p. lxxiv). This makes it clear that it was not Smith's manner, but his matter, or rather his commission itself, that was complained of.

[2] The Archpriest had complained of the too great number of students sent from Douai, especially untrained and untried. This was, of course, the result of Parsons' plan regarding not only that seminary but the general education of the Clergy.

common cause, as he urged the same, and *might proceed of some diabolical spirit to overthrow the seminaries and the missions also.* Some such things are sometimes spoken *in heat of speech and arguing*, especially with one *that will give occasion*, which yet being uttered *without any evil meaning*, yea, with express exception that it was not meant of yourself, to have them related in the worst sense, yea, in a sense never meant, you see how unjust a thing it is, and how contrary to all peace.[1]

"You say that if your agent behave himself not well I should complain here to superiors; but I mean not to trouble myself with any such matter. Superiors are wise enough to note such things of themselves; and, as they can be witnesses to me and for me *that I have not complained of him*,[2] nor made contradiction against him and his affairs, as he imagineth and hath informed you, so will they judge of each man according as they find.

"Your doctrine is good and evangelical, to love not in words and tongue, but in deed and truth; and so I hope you have found in deeds at my hands, whensoever any occasion hath been offered to serve or pleasure you, and the like, I may say, and much more, of your agent, though he for his part doth repay me in far different coin. But between God and him be it.

"You say that you and yours are desirous of our friendship if it may be had. But alas! sir, what difficulty is there of our parts? Have we been actors in these innovations sought? You say that it would be a great provocation to confidence if we would show so great alacrity of countenance for the order given by His Holiness for governing yourselves as you and

[1] Upon this passage Tierney remarks: "How strange, even upon his own very doubtful representation, were the notions entertained by Parsons of what he called peace! Let *Smith* but say that Birkhead has been charged with a 'diabolical spirit,' and all must be in disorder; but let '*one of ours*' actually level this same charge against the whole body of Clergy or at those who have suggested what Birkhead demands, and there is 'no evil meaning,' no violation either of justice or of peace in the proceeding" (vol. v. p. xcix, note).

[2] And yet there is the memorial which Parsons presented to the Pope against Smith in 1609, made up of a "body of slanders," written from England by Holtby the resident superior of the Society (Dodd, ed. Tierney, vol. v. p. 24), in which he does complain of him "to superiors."

yours do. We, you know, *yielded here willingly to the petition*, as we also did before in Clement's time, when it was first decreed.[1] What shall we do more? *We are glad to be excluded from that we never coveted.* If you are glad to be bound as you are, why should we be sorry?[2]

"I could feel deeply that you write that if I seek to oppress your agent by false informations you must bind yourself to defend him, etc. I did never think to receive from you such a speech. Do you think that, after so many years of religion, I have learned to have no more care of my soul than to seek to oppress a man by false informations? You must needs have great credit in him and very little in me that can believe this . . . But all is well that endeth well. I will doubt nothing of your good meaning in all; and so shall remain with old affection towards you, and pray God ever to preserve you as myself. This 20th day of March 1610.—Your loving friend ever, R. P."

This letter shows, then, Parsons was confirmed to the very last in his Puritanism. He had so blinded himself to realities as to be able to convince himself that all he did must be right. What plain folk would call falsehoods, such as suppression of truths and suggestions of what was false, in him were now entirely void of offence. For had he not once gone through the Great Purification of the Intention, and could he not therefore persuade himself he meant well in everything? This letter is a proof of that darkness which had been gathering about him throughout his career, and which now, towards the end, seems to have completely shrouded his conscience.

Besides this last attempt at clutching at the superiority over the Clergy, Parsons was occupying himself in polemical literature. He produced, among other works, *An Answer to the fifth part of Reportes lately set forth by Sir Edward Cook, Knight, the King's Attorney-General* (1606); *A Treatise to mitigation . . . against the seditious Writings of Thomas Morton*,

[1] But see the letter to Garnett, quoted at p. 271, *ante*.

[2] And yet Parsons had induced Birkhead to act in opposition to the order of Clement VIII., and promised him the support of the whole Society if he did so.

Minister, 1607;[1] *The Judgment of a Catholic Englishman . . concerning a late book entitled "Triplici nodo triplex cuneus"* (1608); *A quiet and sober Reckoning with Mr. Thomas Morton somewhat set in choler by his Adversary* (1609); and an unpublished MS., now in Balliol College, entitled, *Epitome Controversarum hujus tempore.*[2]

The old champion of his Society was now approaching his end. The spring of 1610 found him ever active, but gradually getting weaker. But he kept the fast rigorously. In the middle of Lent, his old enemy, fever, attacked him, and in a few days the great Jesuit was brought to death's door. The consolations of that religion for whose interests, according to his lights, he had laboured so strenuously, were now eagerly made use of. The Pope, hearing of his approaching end, sent him his blessing and, so More tells us with a little characteristic touch, "all indulgences and favours which are accustomed to be given to cardinals on the approach of death." On Holy Saturday, in spite of his weakness, he wrote three Latin letters: one to the Bishop of St. Omer, recommending the college to his care; one to the Jesuits in England, based on the text, *Love ye one another*, but with the strange omission of any exhortation to extend that love to the Clergy; and one to Birkhead. The two latter are worthy of production:—

"To the English Jesuits.

"My Reverend and most dear Fathers and Brothers, whom it has pleased God to call and unite in this mission of our Society for the conversion and comfort of unhappy England, our country, and over whom it has seemed fit to our very reverend Father General to commit to me, for so many years, the prefectship; now, when according to the divine will I am about to lay down this burthen, as I hope, together with this mortal life, I cannot say farewell to you all without writing this, first to commend to your prayers myself and the repose of my soul in God; then to (recommend) among you that one sign of the true disciples and followers of Christ the Lord—

[1] This contains as its greater part an elaborate treatise on Equivocation.

[2] Cox's MS., No. 314.

Love ye one another; which I hope will be kept by you inviolate according to the spirit of our Society, which is, that each one considers himself lower than the others and heartily always prefers others to himself as far as can be, and external actions allow; let all things be to the honour and glory of God and your comfort. For so doing all of you, as I trust in the Lord, will finish your course in the service of God in this world and in the next, by the merit of Christ's Passion, we shall meet each other in the glorious and everlasting Resurrection.—Given at Rome from my bed in the English college on this the vigil of the Lord's Resurrection in the year 1610. Yours wholly and always, MARK."

The letter to the Archpriest is conceived in these terms:

"MOST REVEREND LORD AND FRIEND MOST DEAR,—Being in a short time about to end, as I hope, my life here, and to depart to Christ my Saviour, I cannot, in this my great agony, forget you or omit by this letter to bid farewell to you, your assistants and all your other subjects, as a witness of the charity and perfect love I bear and always will bear to you and them in Christ Jesus; and I profess that I now leave the world with the same desire of love, peace, and of union among yourselves, and with all our fathers with which I have always been burning; and that never from our side (as much indeed as I can know or imagine) has there been any lust of superiority over you or any one of you, but only a kindly agreement to the profit and increase of the Catholic faith according to the ministry of our institute. This agreement, I hope, will be preserved in the love of Christ by you and our fathers at all time to the honour and glory of God, the Most High, to whose charge, with the same love and the same affection with which I commend my soul, I also commend you and all my most dear brothers, who are in your charge, with whom joining my prayers I beseech our sweetest Saviour that by the merits of His most bitter Passion He will grant us a glorious Resurrection. Farewell in Christ Jesus.—Given from my bed at Rome in the English college on the vigil of the Resurrection in the year 1610."[1]

[1] More, pp. 386, 387.

These edifying letters show the incapability of judging hi actions which now possessed Parsons. Love, peace, and unio most desirable of gifts, were to be found in obedience to hin Those who had opposed or thwarted him were the disturber The sense of Election made him secure in all he did. I was therefore impossible that he could have been wrong in hi methods. This is the obvious interpretation to be put upo these letters. But the reader may ask how could Parsons o his deathbed conceive that he had sought no superiority ove the Clergy, when it is clear that the greater part of his lif was spent in securing it? There was in him no mere vulga lust of domination. It was a settled conviction, which wa now passionless and well disciplined. To him it was so eviden that it was to the greater glory of God (as he saw it) that th Society should direct the Catholics of England, that suc superiority he aimed at could not be unlawful nor be mad the subject of animadversion. It was in this sense that h makes the statement. There is not here any attempt, w think, at deliberate untruth, for the religious instinct, thoug misguided, was not absent. He is but stating a fact as he sa it from his special position. That his Society should have th superiority was his life's aim; and so clearly had he impresse this on his brethren that More, the indiscreet, does not hesitat to say at a later day when the question of withdrawing th Jesuits out of England was again mooted: "Perhaps eve these missions might with greater propriety and greater con venience (let not the expression offend) be entrusted t members of our Society than to other men."[1]

Parsons also wrote or dictated a paper to the Genera giving his opinion upon the future administration of th English Mission. Up to the very last he preserved tha extraordinary capacity for ceaseless activity which had alway marked him.

When the last few moments came, he called for a touchin souvenir of his work in England. The rope which hange Campion to the felon's tree at Tyburn had been secured yea ago by Parsons as a cherished relic of his friend. Now that hi own last hour was at hand, he reverently kissed the martyr

[1] P. 150.

trophy, and placed it about his own neck.[1] And thus the soul of Robert Parsons passed away on 15th April 1610, being then in his sixty-fifth year of age, the thirty-sixth of his entry and the twenty-third of his solemn profession into the Society.

More tells us that the surgeon who embalmed the body found the heart placed in an extraordinary high position; and mentions that the same surgeon recovered from a quartan ague, which was ascribed to the holiness of the dead Jesuit.

He was buried at his own request in the chapel of the English college, near to the grave of his former companion, Cardinal Allen,[2] and the following epitaph, which we here translate, was placed on his tomb:—

D. O. M.
TO THE MOST UPRIGHT AND MOST LEARNED FATHER,
ROBERT PARSONS,
AN ENGLISHMAN OF SOMERSETSHIRE,
PRIEST OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS,
AND OF THIS COLLEGE THE MOST EXCELLENT RULER;
WHO
EDUCATED AND TRAINED TO VIRTUE
AND FORMED WITH MUCH LABOUR YOUTHS OF GREAT PROMISE
WHOM,
FOR THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND
HE HAD GATHERED TOGETHER IN COLLEGES AND HOSPICES
WHICH IN FITTING PLACES
HAD BEEN ENTIRELY FOUNDED OR ENDOWED BY HIM
AT SEVILLE, VALLADOLID, CADIZ, LISBON, DOUAI,
ST. OMER, ROME.
WITH WHOM, AS LEADER AND COMPANION,
FATHER EDMUND CAMPION,
THAT BOLD DEFENDER OF THE CATHOLIC COMMONWEALTH,
FIRST OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS,
PASSED OVER INTO ENGLAND.
HE WAS THE AVENGER AND CHAMPION OF TRUTH;

---

[1] Jouvency, p. 188.

[2] "It is recorded that on 1st March 1687 the floor of the church of the English college fell into the vaults beneath, near the altar of St. Thomas of Canterbury, without harm to anyone. Father Parsons' bones and skull were laid bare; being gathered up, they were put into a wooden box and reinterred in the same spot. The father minister who was present remarks that Father Parsons' head was of unusual size" (Foley, vol. iv. p. 572). When Rome fell into the hands of the French in 1798 the tombs in the English college were rifled, and bullets made of the lead of the coffins. Parsons' bones were scattered. When the college was regained by the English Clergy, his monument was set up in the wall.

HE PURSUED ON ALL SIDES THE FOOLHARDINESS OF OPPONENTS;
DEFENDED RELIGION
AND REFASHIONED HOLINESS,
BY BOOKS, WRITINGS, SERMONS, LETTERS, EXAMPLE.
WHILST ENGAGED IN THESE AFFAIRS
HE TOOK TO HIMSELF NO SHARE IN A WELL-EARNED REPOSE,
AND NEVER SHRUNK FROM THE PERSONAL DANGER OF
HONOURABLE DEFENCE,
EVER READY, EVER RESOLUTE,
EVER RUSHING
INTO THE FIRE OF MOST DANGEROUS CONTROVERSY,
A MAN ALTOGETHER LAVISH OF HIS GREAT SOUL.
HE COMPLETED SIXTY-FOUR YEARS,
OF WHICH HE PASSED IN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS THIRTY-SIX
THROUGH EVERY PATTERN OF VIRTUE.
HE DIED APRIL 15, 1610.

D. O. M.
PATRI ROBERTO PERSONIO
ANGLO SOMERSETANO
SOCIETATIS JESU
SACERDOTI INTEGERRIMO ATQUE DOCTISSIMO
ET HUJUSCE COLLEGII OPTIMO MODERATORI
QUI AD ANIMI CULTUM ET STUDIUM PIETATIS
AD ANGLIÆ CONVERSIONEM, COLLEGIORUM
DOMICILIIS AC DIVERSORIIS PER OPPORTUNA LOCA
QUA PER ILLUM EX INTEGRO CONSTITUTIS
QUA COLLOCUPLETATIS
AB IPSO, MAGNÆ SPEI CONVOCAVIT, MAGNIS
LABORIBUS INSTITUIT, JUVENTUTEM HISPALI,
VALLISOLETI, GADIBUS, ULISOPONE, DUACI,
AUDOMARI, ROMÆ.
QUO DUCE ET SOCIO PATER
EDMUNDUS CAMPIANUS
CATHOLICÆ REI PUBLICÆ
PROPUGNATOR ACERRIMUS
IN ANGLIAM PRIMUS EX SOCIETATE TRAJECIT;
QUOQUE VINDICE
ET PATRONO VERITATIS, HOSTIUM PASSIM EXAGITATA
TEMERITAS, LIBRIS, SCRIPTIS, SERMONIBUSQUE, LITTERIS,
EXEMPLIS, DEFENSA RELIGIO, RECREATA SANCTITAS.
CUM INTER HÆC IPSE NULLAM CAPERET PARTEM
CONCESSÆ QUIETIS, NULLUM A SUO CAPITE RECUSARET
DISCRIMEN HONESTISSIMÆ DEFENSIONIS
SEMPER PARATUS, SEMPER ERECTUS
SEMPER MEDIAM FLAMMAM PERICULOSISSIMÆ

CONCERTATIONIS IRRUMPENS ANIMÆ MAGNÆ
PRODIGUS OMNINO VIR,
LXIV. EXPLEVIT ANNOS,
EX QUEIS SEX ET TRIGINTA IN SOCIETATE JESU
PER OMNIA VIRTUTIS
EXEMPLA TRANSEGIT
OBIIT XV. APRILIS MDCX.

This inscription, which, by the bye, contains no prayer for his soul, is like all other mortuary notices written by sorrowing friends. They seldom err on the side of modesty.

In personal appearance Parsons is described as swarthy and forbidding: "a big, burly and tall fellow." From his portrait, one would be held by his piercing eye, which gives, however, the impression of subtlety. The face lit up by a smile could be winning and attractive, but swept by a storm of anger or indignation, it could also be terrible. There is a certain grim humour, perhaps, about the mouth, which readily turns to sarcasm. The chin, in its massiveness, suggests great determination and pertinacity of purpose; and the grand noble forehead marks him out as a leader of men, and as of high mental powers. Portraits of Parsons are to be found on the frontispiece of More's *History*, in Cornelius Hazart's *Kerkelijke Historie*, by Neefft, and in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1774. There is also one at the English college at Valladolid. There is another sometimes printed in *A Christian Directory*. The portrait given at the beginning of this volume was found by the author in an old print shop in London. There is no artist's name affixed.

We must now proceed to estimate the character of the great Jesuit; and first we will give some of the testimonies of his friends.

More, in his *History*, speaks of him in these terms: "This is certain, great soever as he was in gifts, diligent in affairs, yet he always cultivated solid and perfect virtue, and retained it all his life; and as, according to the philosophers, the first in every kind is the rule and measure of the rest, so he can fittingly seem to be set by God for an example of those virtues which are to be sought in a man fitted for this kind of mission;

namely, that, he may be held in consideration and great-minded. Patient in waiting, bold in doing, he greatly detested any quarrelsome and noisy way of action: he used reason often to convince, and then, having smoothed over the difficulties, he would suggest ways by which the end he was aiming at could be attained. Infinite are the affairs he transacted with popes, kings, cardinals, and other principal men, sometimes by word, sometimes by letter, both of which were well calculated to persuade. Neither did he despise any common person, being always benevolent to all, and where he could, beneficent. . . . Among these occupations he seized fitting times for writing, either to stir up the souls of Catholics to piety, or to expose the deceits and madnesses of heretics, in both of which kinds of writing he excelled, mixing cleverly and agreeably urbane words with serious, so as honestly to please the friendly reader, and to wound the enemy not too deeply. He laboured greatly in soothing and restraining the unquiet dispositions of the students of the English college, who, under former administrators, were frequently noisy; bringing about observance by the very dignity of his person and the form of his discourses and by most watchfully excluding the approach of turbulent men, and, what is most to the point, by putting before him in every action, virtue and the true zeal of God, and by all methods instilling it into the tender souls of the youths as oil to a lamp. With what ardour he burned to restore the island to the faith, with what hope in God he promoted the affair, how he surpassed all in charity, is shown, not only by his written books, but also by so many journeys, hither and thither, by land and sea, for the sake of founding and establishing seminaries, without which there is no doubt (the old priests dying out) religion would have succumbed.

"In all of which affairs he allowed nothing to be to his own private profit or to that of his relations; but he observed perfect abnegation both of money and of honour, and in this, rather than in other matters, is he to be followed, and in truth to be admired. He always had on his lips the words of the Apostle: *And let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.*[1] And so he neglected

[1] Galatians vi. 9.

nothing that he knew would make for the increase of the Catholic faith. When once having maturely taken up anything, he did not easily lose heart, understanding that temporal aid, which was necessary for beginning His work, was to be gathered in by the liberality of God. . . . With which trust he set himself out in his latter years to propagate the Society and founded the houses of Louvain and Watten; and when he had seen these happy beginnings he was called to receive in heaven the fruit of his harvest."[1]

Father Constable, in his attack upon Dodd, under the name of Alethes (*Clerophilus*), twice styles Parsons "this great and holy man."[2] Tanner, in his *Societas Jesu Apostolorum Imitatrix*, speaks of him as "a most mild and most humble man."[3]

Dr. Oliver, in his *Collection towards illustrating the Biography of the Scotch, English, and Irish Members of the Society of Jesus* (1845), says: "So intimately is the biography of this great and good man connected with the history of his times, that a volume would be required to do justice to his memory. We have invariably observed that in proportion as men were wise and eminent and devout to the cause of religion, they have esteemed and admired and venerated his character. . . . Who can read his letters, who can follow him in his course of government of the English Roman College, or in his office of Prefect of the Mission, without being enraptured with his moderation, sound discretion, condescension, and charity."

And, in quite recent references to Parsons and his fellow-workers, a writer in *The Month*, while speaking of them as "men whose memory the present writer and his religious brethren have been taught to respect,"[4] says: "Those who know best what true and sterling men their forefathers were, will fear least the publication of the whole truth concerning them." But he wisely adds: "The true greatness of their heroes was sometimes disfigured by faults and infirmities."

And on another occasion the same writer says: "(*Parsons*) was animated throughout by sincere patriotism, and can plead in self-defence many undeniable and far-

[1] More, pp. 388, 389.
[2] *A Specimen of Amendment*, pp. 196, 200.
[3] P. 398.
[4] December 1897.

reaching excuses. He served no personal ambitions, he descended to no dishonourable practices. But in excess of zeal, in over-anxiety for the triumph of right, in undisciplined readiness to rush into the breach, he took part in unworkable schemes for the forcible rectification of gross abuses—schemes in which, even had they been practicable, it was unbefitting for him to engage." [1]

To these testimonies we must add those of Father Parsons himself, who, under the veil of anonymity, shows us, in such terms as these, his own estimate of his character and work:

"That reverend and religious man." [2]

"And we doubt not but that it will be no small part of his great merits in setting forward God's cause to bear with patience (as we hear he doth) such insolent and intemperate railings at these men's hands," etc.[3]

"The reverend religious man whose merits towards them and theirs (the Clergy) and us all are not unknown."

He does not hesitate to compare himself to David [4] and to the Christ Himself.[5]

In another work written for use in Rome he speaks of himself and Allen as "Moses and Joshua," "Aaron and Hur" and takes the opportunity of impressing the cardinals with these words: "Now what is to be said of these two most illustrious men (I speak of Allen and Parsons), who, as two most shining lights of our country, have been clearly given to us by the divine kindness, that in this darksome and most dense night of England they might, in the gloom, pour out the clear light of truth into the hearts of many in the mist of heresies, and as burning torches inflame them with the divine fire of charity." [6] In this same work he also mentions himself as "the best and most religious father." [7]

These are testimonies of friends and perhaps of partial critics, such as would naturally take the best view of his character. We cannot rely upon these words any more than upon the vituperations heaped upon him alive or dead by his

[1] *Ibid.* No. 423, p. 245. [2] *The Doleful Knell of Thomas Bell.* (Preface
[3] *Manifestation of the Great Folly, etc.* p. 26.
[4] *Briefe Apologie*, p. 181. [5] *Ibid.* p. 108.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 80. [7] *Ibid.* p. 126.

enemies. For us, writing with his life laid open before us, in the forcible language of deeds, it is a duty to arrive at a calm and dispassionate judgment upon a man who was no mean factor in the making of English history.

Great indeed was Parsons, and in ability and power he stands head and shoulders above his brethren, the English Jesuits. Look at him from almost any point you will, he was great. Fertile in expedients, unwearied in toil, capable of holding in his hands a hundred complex threads, prompt in action, quite unscrupulous at times as to his means, restless in activity, warm-hearted to a degree when not thwarted, subtle, crafty, patient in pursuit of his ends, absolutely confident in himself, a hater who would have pleased Dr. Johnson, an anxiety to his friends: these are characteristics which will be at once recognised by the reader. A master of rhetoric and of vituperative controversy, he knew how, by the suppression of essential facts, by misquotations, by an appearance of vast learning and reading, to convince his friends of the utter hopelessness of an opponent's case; and thus he was able to play the part of a great leader, and win the confidence of those who could favour his ends. Had he not become a Catholic, it is most likely, with such gifts as these, he would have risen high in that wonderful body of statesmen who served Elizabeth so well. As it was, having that strong bent towards Puritanism, when he found the Society could best answer all his wants, he surrendered himself to it heart and soul. He thought to find the greater glory of God in the exaltation of what was, to him, the Society of the Elect. Puritanism gives a consistency to his whole life, and enables us to understand, even if we may not approve of, the point of view from which he regarded all things. His secular policy was to find its fulfilment in the advance of his Jesuits as the regenerators of a fallen England. His ecclesiastical policy, all the measures of which are so many links in a well-defined chain, was also directed towards securing their supremacy. He was so happy in his calling that he could not understand how the methods which brought him so much contentment would not do the same for everyone else. If the blind confidence he had in himself and his position explains his

treatment of the Clergy, it also shows how he came to use, without scruple, means which were evil in themselves, however useful to his end. The great law of the Decalogue, *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour*, was over and over again set at defiance under the exigencies of the moment. We, indeed, are not allowed to peer into the inner recesses of his conscience; we can only judge him by his outward acts and words. But the astonishment which such violations of the moral law must provoke in the minds of all candid persons will be lessened when they remember the theological atmosphere in which he lived and the distinctions and doctrines which were then prevalent and were so appealing to a subtle mind like that of Robert Parsons. He may have so managed to refine matters in his conscience, that the suppression of a truth did not necessarily imply to him the suggestion of a falsehood. But while we grant that the Supreme Judge is alone capable of estimating the true morality of his actions, we are not hindered from taking warning from the life of a man who did not seek peace and ensue it. Not for us are the weapons he used; neither are his methods those that will lead men to Christ.

To the writer there is a touch of infinite pathos in the story of this great Jesuit. The man who had striven so mightily, who in pursuit of his ideal had even sacrificed that obedience he had vowed, who had set Truth at defiance whilst spending his life in its defence, has Failure writ large across the page of his history. What did his statecraft avail? His ecclesiastical monopoly? He saw the one break down, and the other end in disaster. He saw the result in Englishmen distrustful of the religion of their fathers which came to them disfigured in the garb of politics. He saw the result in discord and faction which reigned amongst the ministers of the Gospel of Peace. He gave his all, his life and powers, to recommend to his countrymen the Catholic faith: the harvest reaped has been alienation. When we think of a man so great and gifted thus paying, by failure, the debt due to inexorable Truth, there is in the spectacle a pathos which raises the history of Robert Parsons to the dignity of a human tragedy.

CHAPTER XIV

THE TURNING OF THE TIDE

THE death of Parsons did not change the policy he had given to his brethren. The Archpriest Birkhead wrote to his agent in Rome (25th August 1610): "You write that Paul (*the Pope*) thinketh we shall be more quiet now that Parsons is dead; but when you come I can tell you of some that, I fear, will prosecute matters as hotly as he; and so God knoweth when peace will have place among us."[1]

The disputes that began about this time concerning the administration of the college at Douai were a proof. During Parsons' lifetime the president, Dr. Worthington, was entirely at his disposal. Parsons had set him there, and a Jesuit confessor had been imposed on the students.[2] The Spanish pension ceased to be paid to this secular college;[3] and theological lectures were no longer given. The older priests, who held to Allen's traditions, were sent away, and two most incompetent men, Singleton and Norton, were sent by Parsons to keep the president in the way he should walk. The students had to go to the Jesuit college in the town, there to receive such instructions as were considered fit and proper. Parsons, in the other seminaries, had found the inconveniences of such a practice; both in Spain[4] and St. Omer the English Jesuits

[1] *Tierney*, vol. v. p. 28, note.

[2] More, p. 248.

[3] The pensions passed through the hands of the Jesuits, who looked after their friends. "Most of the English are in despair about their pensions, which are two years in arrears, so that they sell a hundred crowns for twenty-five pounds. Stanley, Owen, and a few others are paid, and Owen has procured five hundred crowns a year from Naples for himself. Douai College has not been paid for two years, yet can afford five hundred pounds for building" (Cal. S. P. Dom. Eliz. (*Add.*), vol. 34, No. 39).

[4] Blackfan says (1612) that the students, "moved by what spirit I know not, refused to go to the lectures at the college of St. Ambrose in Valladolid." Many were in consequence sent away, but in 1613 it was seen necessary to give way on this point.

withdrew their pupils from the public schools and established regular classes at home. But for Douai, no. The natural result was that the finances were crippled; and from the flourishing establishment of Allen's days, the English college at Douai, drained as it was by St. Omer and the entirely unnecessary Spanish houses, found itself on the verge of destruction. In 1599 the cardinal-protector forbade the president, until the debts were paid, to receive on the foundation any who were not qualified to begin rhetoric; but shortly after an illiterate student was received because he was "recommended by the Reverend Father Parsons."[1] No student could in theory be sent there except by the Archpriest; but the Jesuit rectors of the other seminaries sent students at discretion. Anyone they wanted to get rid of was sent to Douai, while the most promising students there were taken off to Rome. Creswell acted as master of all. Writing to Worthington (30th January 1608), he says: "For those [*students*] any other who shall, at any time, come as sent to you with ordinary letters, know that we mean not to oblige you to receive them: but they are ever desirous to come there themselves, and we have no better means to discharge them quietly and without public scandal. Wherefore be advised that except they bring some extraordinary commendations, we leave it to your discretion to let them pass as they come."[2] Creswell, it may be mentioned, was the one through whose hands passed the pension allowed to Douai.

All this was a part of a fixed policy towards the English Clergy. The standard of the students sent from Douai was lowered. "Subjected to no probation, trained to no discipline, the scholars were in many instances hurried through an imperfect course of study and dispatched with the hasty gleanings of a few weeks or months' instruction to enter on the duties of the mission. As they came without learning, so they not unfrequently came without virtue and without religion. Scandals of course followed . . . The adversaries of the Clergy pointed to the weaknesses or the delinquencies of their brethren, and mingling truth with falsehood, exaggerating some things, insinuating others, and carefully omitting to specify the names

[1] Douai Diaries (MS.).

[2] *Tierney*, vol. iv. p. ccxviii.

of the accused, sought to create a prejudice against the whole body of the secular priesthood. Unfortunately they were but too successful. The Catholics, filled with a vague suspicion of danger, gradually closed their doors against any members of the Clergy with whom they were not personally acquainted."[1] The Archpriest complains that even those who had been at work in England for thirty years were destitute: the alms went to the Jesuits. "But exceeding little cometh to my hand. The great gobbets go where the distributors please, who are all for our opposites; for I have as yet small favour amongst them. I believe it is done to weary me."[2]

At one time, when it seemed that the constant appeal for bishops was about to be heard, Parsons thought the moment had come to foreclose on Douai. "Fitzherbert wrote a secret letter to Worthington inviting him to accept the appointment" of bishop.[3] The price was to be the betrayal of the college into the hands of the Society. Singleton was the apparent mover in the transaction, and said "he had authority from the fathers to do so."[4] This brilliant scheme, however, came to nothing.

But as soon as Parsons died, Worthington, who in 1609 had refused to accept a generous offer made by the Archpriest to liquidate the debts, now turned round and tried to make peace with his brethren. In 1612, arbitrators met at Douai to consider the best means of restoring the college to its former prosperous state. Among the matters settled it was arranged that professors should be reintroduced, so that the students could study at home; that the confessor of the house should be chosen from the Clergy, and that the president's assistants and advisers should be changed. These were agreed to by Worthington; and the cardinal-protector was petitioned to consent to the reforms. Three months after, an ungracious answer was returned from Rome, declaring that "no innovation would be allowed." For a long time the struggle went on. The Jesuits clung to the influence that the post of confessor gave, and strenuously opposed the removal of Norton and

[1] Dodd (ed. Tierney), vol. v. p. 6.
[2] Birkhead to Smith (9th October 1609), *Tierney*, vol. v. p. 7, note.
[3] Dodd (ed. Tierney), vol. v. p. 18.
[4] *Tierney*, vol. v. p. vii.

Singleton. These two succeeded in procuring a visitation, o the grounds that the unhappy Worthington had been a ba administrator. The visitors were attached to the Jesuit party and, in spite of what they found and heard of from th students, they reported that the president was everything tha was bad, while Norton and Singleton[1] were admirable me The students on their side petitioned that the college migh be entirely freed from any dependence upon the Society; an in reply to the visitors' denial of any interference, they com plained that Coniers, the confessor, "had exceeded the bound of his spiritual office in order to impose unauthorised and un necessary restrictions on the scholars; and that while som students known to have dedicated themselves in intention t the Society were retained on the foundation, others for a mer attachment to the rival order of St. Benedict had bee expelled the establishment."[2] To rebut these and othe charges the visitors appealed to the president, who to thei surprise did not deny what the students asserted. The im mediate result was that the Jesuits procured the remova of Worthington, and kept the post of confessor.[3] It was no until after a long struggle that Kellison, the next rector, wh at once began to receive again the Spanish pension, was abl to restore his college to anything like independence.

We have already seen how the Archpriest Birkhead ha released himself from the influence of the Society: it onl remains to quote his last letter to the Jesuits, written fro his deathbed (5th April 1614):

[1] Singleton died in the Jesuit house of Liège, 1620. The *Annual Letters* for th year say: "The holy soul of Dr. William Singleton took flight, as we trust, to heave from our arms . . . (*He was*) one who ever was a friend of ours . . . and suffere also much in defence of the Society." Foley, vol. v. p. 997.

[2] Dodd (ed. Tierney), vol. v. p. 41.

[3] Kellison, writing to the Protector (5th December 1616), complains of the extr ordinary behaviour of the confessor, who, giving a conference to the students up the sacrament of penance, took the opportunity of saying that, as the Pope h judged it expedient that a Jesuit should be appointed confessor to the college, whos ever thought otherwise most grievously sinned against obedience, and consequent was guilty of an enormous crime, and was obliged to reveal this to the confesso And he alleged as a reason why a Jesuit should be appointed, that they, bei regulars, were prudent and virtuous, and therefore better fitted as directors th secular priests, few of whom were fit for such duties. See the letter in *Tierne* vol. v. p. ccviii.

"It resteth now . . . to entreat that you would lovingly oncur and charitably help the Clergy of this kingdom, for hose assistance you were first sent into this harvest. I know our profession is honourable in God's Church, your labours gainst heresy and sin commendable; but if peace and charity uide not your endeavours, we labour in vain, and all will erish and come to destruction and ruin that we have under-ken. I have dealt with the chiefest of mine own, whom I now you have held in greater jealousy than there is cause; nd to deal plainly and sincerely with you, I find them most eady to give you that correspondence (*which*) is necessary you hould give one another who travel in so holy a work. They nly desire that in their government you meddle no further than ney do in yours: withal that you oppose not yourselves in ny suit they propose to the chief pastor, for the good of their wn body; especially in matters of superiority which canoni-ally belongeth to their vocation. This being done, there will e no occasion but that you will friendly and charitably set orward this great work you have undertaken."[1]

Here is the Clergy's case in a nutshell. They wanted to ind their own business; and this was the very thing their pponents would not allow.

The Jesuits were strengthening their position all round. lready had they secured a novitiate solely for the use of the nglish. By the generosity of a noble Spanish lady, Doña uisa de Carvajal, who, under Fr. Blackfan, left her native land o minister to the persecuted Catholics, Fr. Parsons was able o open a novitiate in Louvain (1607). This was transferred n 1614 to Liège, and in 1625 was removed to Watten, two eagues from St. Omer. The college at Liège remained, owever, in their hands, and was used as the house of theology. t Ghent, in 1621, the house of the "Third Probation" was pened; and it also served as "a place of residence for uch of their fathers as were disabled either through age or nfirmity, or any other way rendered unserviceable for the ission."[2]

Besides their college at St. Omer for boys, they had, ractically as houses of theirs, the English college at Rome,

[1] *Tierney*, vol. v. p. clxi. [2] Dodd, vol. ii. p. 342.

the seminaries at Valladolid, Seville, and smaller establish ments at Madrid and elsewhere.

While thus increasing on the Continent in material pros perity, their numbers, too, were rising. In 1614 they had 5 priests in England, the next year 68, and in 1619 nearly 100 It was time therefore that the English Jesuits should receive definite *status* in the Society. Hitherto they had only existe as a Mission. But now, when joined to their material an numerical success, there were hopes of better things in Englanc owing to the contemplated Spanish marriage, the Genera Mutius Vitelleschi, seeing that their whole body numbere 212, raised England into a Vice-Province in 1619, with F Blount as Vice-Provincial. The first Vice-Provincial congrega tion was held in 1622 at the house of the French ambassado at Blackfriars. The next year England became a regularl constituted Province of the Society. Blount, who was the firs Provincial, divided the country into twelve districts, each c which had a number of quasi-colleges and residences. "T each of these so-called colleges was allotted some revenu which might form the nucleus of future colleges in the muc desired event of the restoration of the ancient faith and religio of our forefathers in England. To each college, as also t the residences, a certain number of missionary fathers wa assigned with a Superior, who in the case of a college wa styled "Rector," in that of a residence, "Superior."[2]

Hardly had the Province been erected, when a terribl disaster took place in a chapel situated over the Gatehouse c the French ambassador's house at Blackfriars. It is known a *The Doleful Even-song*. "Fr. Drury, a Jesuit, was preachin (on Sunday afternoon, 26th October 1623) to some two c three hundred people, on the gospel, *The kingdom of heaven likened to a man being a king that would make an account wit his servant*, which when he had read, he sat down in th chair and put upon his head a red quilt cap having a line white one under it, turned up about the brim; and so unde

[1] In London district, 23; Yorkshire, 10; Hants, 8; Lincolnshire, 7; Lancashir 12; Suffolk, 7; Staffordshire, 4; Northampton, 7; Leicestershire, 9; Worcestershir 5; Wales, 10. This does not include the lay-brothers.

[2] Foley, vol. vii. p. xii.

took his text. . . . Most certain it is and over manifest by lamentable evidence, that when the said Jesuit had proceeded about half an hour in this his sermon, there befell that preacher and auditory the most unexpected and sudden calamity that this age hath heard of, to come from the hand, not of man but God, in the midst of a sacred exercise of what kind or religion soever. The floor whereon that assembly stood or sat, not sinking by degrees, but at one instant failing and falling by the breaking of a main sommier or dormer of that floor; which beam, together with joices and planches thereto adjoined, with the people thereon, rushed down with such a violence that the weight and fall thereof brake in sunder another far stronger and thicker sommier of the chamber situated directly underneath, and so both the ruined floor with the people overlapped and crushed under or between them, fell (without any time of stay) upon a lower third floor; being the floor of the said Lord Ambassador's withdrawing chamber, which was supported underneath with archwork of stone (yet visible in the Gate-house there), and so became the boundary or term of that confused and doleful heap of ruins, which otherwise had sank yet deeper by the own weight and height of the downfall, to the lowest where they lay, being about two-and-twenty feet in depth."[1]

The rumour of this awful accident soon spread, and the city authorities came to the rescue. Some ninety or a hundred perished, among whom were Fr. Drury and another Jesuit, Fr. Rediate. Some were buried in the churchyard of St. Andrew's, Holborn; while "in the fore-court of the said French ambassador's house was digged a great pit[2] (eighteen feet long and twelve feet broad) in which were laid forty-four corpses in order, piled one upon the other. . . . Upon this common grave was set up in the earth a black cross of wood about four feet high, which, on Tuesday in the afternoon, was by one of the ambassador's servants taken up and carried into the house, lest (as it seemeth) any scandal shall be taken thereat by the

[1] *The Doleful Even-song*, by Rev. Samuel Clarke, a Puritan minister.

[2] "The Bishop of London not allowing them burial in either churches or churchyards" (S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. cliv. No. 8). If this is true it must have been after the burial of some at St. Andrew's, Holborn.

people that then and after came to that house to view th stage of this mournful tragedy. There was another pit als (twelve feet long, eight feet broad), made in the sai ambassador's garden near adjoining, wherein fifteen other were interred."[1]

While the Government behaved well, the rabble "bein grown savage and barbarous . . . refused to assist them (*th sufferers*) with drink, aqua vitæ, or any other cordials in thei necessity, but rather insulted upon them with taunts and gibe in their affliction, as they were carried away all that evenin and the following night . . . and even in Cheapside, wher they should be more civil, they were ready to pull and tea them out of the coaches as they passed to their lodgings or t the surgeons. But there was as good order taken as might b on the sudden to repress the violence and inhumanity of th multitude and for the relief of the distressed."[2] Fr. Joh Floyd wrote "a word of comfort" for the survivors, and dwell upon the infamous conduct of the people.

Another event, which took place a few years after, ma here be chronicled. In the March 1628, a house belongin to the Earl of Shrewsbury at Clerkenwell was found to b occupied by a community of Jesuits. More gives the followin account of an event of which he was most likely an eyewitness "A day had been fixed for the renewal of the vows of som and for the solemn profession of others. The matter wa not conducted with sufficient caution; for the neighbourin Protestants noticed an unusual amount of provisions an necessaries carried in. This excited their suspicion. Th envy, too, of the shopkeepers close by was aroused, for th extra supplies were bought at a distance to hinder suspicio and not from their shops. They therefore gave notice, an the house was surrounded about nine o'clock in the mornin The pursuivants broke in and searched the house from top t bottom. The Rector was taken. He was hidden with som fathers in a cellar underground, with the altar plate an furniture; others were caught elsewhere. They were co ducted to different prisons and tried. One only was co demned to death, having admitted the fact of his priesthoo

[1] *Ibid.* [2] S. P. O. Dom. Jac. I. vol. cliv. No. 17.

which could not indeed be concealed, as he had publicly lived and acted as a priest in the house of the ambassador."[1] This discovery took place on the 15th of March.

All the papers were seized; but to the disappointment of the Parliament, which hoped to find treasonable matter to use against the King, there was nothing incriminating. But some account-books were found, and they give some curious information.

The Jesuits had had a house at Edmonton during 1624, and the receipts for that house amounted to £227, 13s. 2d., while the expenses are thus accounted for—

Bread and beer	£22	13	6
Wine	11	16	4
Flesh	57	14	0
Wood and coals	23	10	4
House rent	44	0	0
Servants	18	0	0
Subsidy and payments to the King	7	15	8
Spice and sugar	9	3	0
Poor and Church	6	7	2
Candles, salt, etc.	17	15	3
Hire of horses, and things about the house	8	15	1
	£227	10	4

These sums multiplied sixfold will give us the probable equivalent in present-day money.

They then moved (May 1625) to Camberwell, and remained there for twenty months. The expenses for that time were £346, 18s. 1d. From Camberwell they moved to Clerkenwell, two weeks before the discovery. The house served as a kind of novitiate and residence for the Provincial. It was called officially *Domus probationis Sti. Ignatii.*

Among the papers taken is said to have been "a letter found among some Jesuits lately taken at Clerkenwell, London, directed to the Father Rector at Bruxelles." This letter purports to reveal an insidious plot of the English Jesuits to stir up strife between the political parties in the nation for their own benefit. "Twice a day we can divulge what we

[1] *Hist. Prov. Angliæ*, p. 467.

list in Paul's and the Exchange, and we have already rendered our irreconcilable enemy the Duke (*Buckingham*) as odious as a toad; for the people are apt to believe anything against him. We hope to be revenged on that ball of wildfire and quench his fury, and before two years be at an end we hope to see the Duke in Spain with a nail in his forehead carrying that illustrious prince, the Count of Olivares, in his chair about Madrid . . . Now we have planted that sovereign drug Arminianism, which we hope will purge the Protestants from their heresy and flourish and bear fruit in due season . . . cannot choose but laugh to see some of our coat, how they have accommodated themselves; you would not know them if you saw them, and it is admirable how in speech and gesture they act the Puritans. The Cambridge scholars, to their woeful experience, shall see we can act the Puritan better than they can act the Jesuit, etc. etc. etc."

This letter is admittedly a forgery from beginning to the end; and it is worth while mentioning that in the official list of papers taken there is not one mentioned which corresponds with this. The author was probably a Sir John Maynard.[1]

We have referred to the Spanish match, and the hopes that were based upon it. James as far back as 1604 had proposed to marry his son to a Spanish princess. He wanted money, and his Parliament would not grant it. If he could obtain it as dowry with a Spanish bride, he could then do without Parliament. But the Gunpowder Plot had not only excited the animosity of Protestants against Catholics in England but had revived the national hatred of the Spaniards. Still the negotiations between the two courts were opened in 1611. The marriage was most unpopular in England. As after events proved, the Spaniards had no intention of carrying out any arrangement. Nor as a matter of fact had James; and it may very well have been that one motive of his policy was to show he could do without parliamentary aid. Promises were made, and both sides signed treaties which neither intended to keep. The prospect, however, was attractive to the Clergy who hoped to find in a Catholic princess a protectress. They supported the project both at home and in Rome, and were

[1] For further particulars of this discovery, see *Camden Miscellany*, vol. ii.

made use of by the King to procure the necessary dispensation. But in Rome the English Jesuits were busy in preventing the granting of this dispensation. Two, Talbot and Silisdon, went to Rome for the express purpose, and gave out that James, who had promised to mitigate the severity of the penal laws, had not kept his promise;[1] whereas in the course of a few weeks four thousand persons were released from confinement. The Jesuits succeeded, and the match was broken off.[2] It is at present not known exactly what the object was in thus opposing the match. It is, however, very likely that the other business the agent was on the point of gaining, *i.e.* the nomination of a bishop, had something to do with it; for one of the articles in the treaty between England and Spain secured that a bishop should preside over the Catholic princess's chapel. To destroy the agent's credit with the Pope and King would irritate both against the Clergy, and make the granting of bishops less probable. The Jesuits, however, were not able to hinder the French match, which was agreed upon as soon as Charles had returned from his unsuccessful wooing in Spain. The marriage took place by proxy, in Paris, 8th May 1625.

The presence of a Catholic Queen on the English throne gave a great impetus to Catholicity in this country, and so alarmed the Puritan party that they insisted the King should enforce the laws against Catholics. It was during one of these periodical outbreaks that another of the followers of Campion obtained renown by his martyrdom.

Edmund Arrowsmith was brought up in the college at Douai, and in 1613 was sent to England as a priest, and there laboured zealously. In 1624 he entered the Society in England, and went through his novitiate in London. Two years before that he had been arrested and taken before Bishop Bridgeman of Chester, "where divers ministers were at supper with the

[1] "It is not to be doubted that they who, so near home, and amongst those who are like to know the truth of matters, are not ashamed to report so manifest untruths, will, further off, be more bold in their relations and reports." Farrar to Bennet (Douai, 5th October 1622), *Tierney*, vol. v. p. 122, note.

[2] The Infanta's confessor also played on her feelings, saying: "What a comfortable bedfellow you will have: he who lies by your side and who will be father of your children is certain to go to hell."

bishop, who did all eat flesh, it being in Lent. Dr. Bridgeman made his own apology to Mr. Edmund for eating flesh, saying he was old and weak and was dispensed withal. 'But who dispenses with your lusty ministers there?' said Mr. Edmund 'for they have no such need.' The ministers both before and after supper were busy in disputing with Mr. Edmund, and one time divers of them urging against him at once, he merrily said to the bishop, 'Turn all your dogs loose at once against me, and let us have a loose bait.'"[1] He was released from prison during one of James' political moves in the Spanish treaty.

He returned quietly to the scene of his former labours knowing that his hour had not yet come. The occasion of his last arrest is thus stated in a contemporary MS. in the Westminster archives: "Two in Lancashire had married together; the woman was not Catholic, the man was. There was somewhat in the marriage for which they stood in need of a dispensation.[2] Mr. Arrowsmith was employed in obtaining it. In the meantime the woman became a Catholic. When the dispensation came, Mr. Arrowsmith would not make use of it before the parties had separated for the space of fourteen days, which thing incensed them much against him, so knowing the time when he was to return to their father's house where they lived, they secretly sent word to one Rostern, a Justice of Peace, to come and apprehend a priest. The Justice, not willing to bring his neighbour in danger, sent him word that he was to search his house; that by this means having intelligence, he might convey away the priest. Which being done, the searchers according to custom busied themselves in looking, but could find nobody, so returned home. In their return, about a mile from the gentleman's house, upon the way they met with Mr. Arrowsmith, who being apprehended after some discourse, he said unto a youth (the son of the Justice of the Peace), 'Sir, it is a pity you are not a Catholic'; and being demanded the reason why, he answered 'Because all are damned who die in your religion.' Upon

[1] An Oscott MS. quoted by Foley, vol. ii. pp. 31 *et seq.*

[2] Their name was Holden; and first cousins, which is a prohibited degree of consanguinity in the Catholic Church.

this he received his *mittimus*, and so was carried unto the gaol at Lancaster."[1]

He was tried at the Summer Assizes at Lancaster before Sir Henry Yelverton, a known hater of Catholics, who opened the case with these words: "Sirrah, are you a priest?" to which Arrowsmith meekly replied, "I would to God I were worthy." The Catholic priesthood being counted felony, he left it to the Crown to prove the fact; for no one by English law is obliged to accuse himself. Then the judge asked him if he were no priest; and silence alone was the answer. Accused of being "a seducer who unless some order were taken with him would make half Lancashire popish," he was asked "how he could justify his going beyond seas and taking the order of priesthood in disobedience to the laws of the realm?" "If any man can lawfully accuse me," said Arrowsmith, "I stand here ready to answer him." The only evidence against him was the letter which was written to secure his arrest, and the words he used to young Rostern about becoming a Catholic. On this he was condemned, and to the usual formula Yelverton added these words: "Know shortly thou shalt die aloft between heaven and earth, as unworthy of either; and may thy soul go to hell with thy followers. I would that all the priests in England might undergo the same sentence." "Thanks be to God" was Arrowsmith's only reply.

On Thursday, 28th August 1628, he was led out to die. Tempted up to the last to recant, one saying to him "Take the Oath of Allegiance and your life shall be granted . . . you may live if you will conform to the Protestant religion," he replied, "Oh, sir, how far am I from that, tempt me no more—I am a dying man. In no case, on no condition will I do it." *O Bone Jesu* were his last words as he was thrown off the ladder.

An almost incredible story is told about Yelverton's barbarity. "The judge stood in a chamber window within the town, with a pair of spectacles of long sight upon his nose to behold the execution. . . . After dinner there were presented to him two fat stags, which as he did behold, admiring their fatness, the martyr's head and quarters were

[1] Quoted by Foley, vol. ii. pp. 33–35.

brought into his sight, whereupon he did make uncivil and barbarous comparisons between the quarters of the one and of the other." [1]

The hand of Fr. Arrowsmith is preserved to-day at Ashton in Lancashire, and is venerated as the "Holy Hand." Many miracles, even of recent date, are attributed to the relic of one who laid down his life to find it.

The death of William Harrison (1621), Birkhead's successor as Archpriest, presented a favourable opportunity for the Clergy once more to petition for a bishop. Circumstances were changing, and a new Pope (Gregory XV.) was understood to be more disposed to grant the request. Edward Bennet was sent to Rome on this account, and to ask for the dispensation for the proposed Spanish match. Disturbances had again broken out at the English colleges, and grave charges of maladministration were made and proved.[2] The Pope was so moved that he said were he not too old he would hold the visitation in person.

The old story was repeated. The Jesuits found a strong ally in Cardinal Mellini, who, among other misrepresentations put forward their favourite arguments that episcopal government was not essential to the existence of a provincial church, that to introduce it into England would be to expose the Catholics to additional severities; and that the connection already existing between the French and English Clergy made it probable that the latter, if placed under a bishop, would make common cause and demand the same privileges with the former. On the other side, the arguments of Cardinal Bandini had great weight with the Pope: among other reasons he urged that had bishops been granted disputes would not have occurred, the ill-advised plots against the State would probably not have taken place; and finally, unless the request of the Clergy was granted, it was most likely that the French prelates, relying upon the ancient canons,[3] would take upon themselves to provide the English Church with bishops. A

[1] Quoted in Foley, vol. ii. p. 53.

[2] The papal subsidy for Douai, which was paid through the Rector of the English college at Rome, had not reached its destination for some time. S. P. O. (*Roman Transcripts*), 22nd January 1621.

[3] *Concilium Sardicense*, Canon v.

a matter of fact the Archbishop of Rouen, the nearest metropolitan, was already proposing to do so.

The Jesuits made one last effort. Tobie Matthews, son of the Archbishop of York, a convert and friend of Parsons, was intimate with the Lord Keeper, Bacon. Tobie informed him that the Clergy were petitioning for bishops, and suggested that the King could not suffer bishops claiming the same titles and powers as the prelates of the State Church. Under this impression, James, of course, refused, and communicated his decision to the Pope through the Spanish ambassador. This caused a delay. The Pope was made to understand that James was adverse to his Catholic subjects having any episcopal superior. But Bennet, the agent in Rome, explained to the Spanish ambassador what they really wanted, and told him in plain language that the Jesuits were the only men who opposed the business. Bacon saw through the intrigues of Tobie, and, in writing to the Duke of Buckingham (23rd August 1622), said: "I am afraid that Tobie will prove an apocryphal and no canonical intelligencer; acquainting the State with this project for the Jesuits' rather than for Jesus's sake."[1] When he knew the real state of affairs he dealt effectually with the King, and no further difficulty was made.

The decision Rome came to was this: To appoint a bishop with a foreign title; and, while giving him the powers of an ordinary, to make him revocable at will. The Jesuits had successfully stimulated the fears of the *Curia* that, if an ordinary were granted, English ecclesiastics would be disloyal to the Holy See. The long-proved devotion and the blood shed in defence of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope (a testimony no other nation could show) were unheeded, whilst the interested promptings of adversaries were listened to. These last knew that under an ordinary bishop their privileges would be curtailed; but if a bishop, revocable at will, were appointed, should he venture to meddle with them, his recall could be procured.

Dr. William Bishop, Parsons' whilom prisoner and the first signer of the protestation of allegiance to Elizabeth, was

[1] *Cabala*, p. 70.

nominated (February 1623) Bishop of Chalcedon, with powers as an ordinary over the Catholics of England and Scotland. When he arrived in England, the Superior of the Jesuits called upon him and desired that they might live as good friends together. Bishop told him that the Clergy were content to forget all former wrongs; but (*he*) must hereafter take away all occasion of dissensions. The Superior held that for reason; whereupon he was asked what he had to say against any of the Clergy, so that it might be reformed. He said he had nothing. Then it was pointed out that they were much offended by the misgovernment of the colleges, upon which he said he would write to the superiors to govern well; "which took so small effect," says Bishop, "that shortly after the scholars were thrust out of the college in Rome; so that we are only to attend at their hands fair words, I fear me, but no more good deeds than we can wrest from them."[1]

Bishop did not live long after his appointment. But before he died (16th April 1624) he instituted, by his undoubted power, as ordinary, a Chapter, so that the episcopal jurisdiction should not again lapse. In February 1625 a successor was nominated in the person of Dr. Richard Smith, the former agent at Rome. His appointment was in the same terms. The Council of Trent[2] and a recently published Bull of Gregory XV. (5th February 1622) had declared that regulars, as well as seculars, whether exempt in any way, were obliged to have the previous licence and approbation of the bishop before taking up the cure of souls; and that in all things which concerned this cure they were subject to the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishop as the delegate of the Apostolic See. Dr. Smith, having the powers of an ordinary, felt himself in duty bound to follow the law of the Church in this matter, which was necessary for the due ruling of his flock. He moved very carefully, and from the beginning exhibited a pacific disposition. He waited for two years, and then approached the superiors of the orders and suggested the propriety of their communicating his wishes to their subjects, offering meanwhile to refer the matter to the Holy See, and to provide for the validity of the confessions by provisionally licensing them until such times as Rome

[1] *Tierney*, vol. v. p. cclxxv.

[2] Sess. 23, cap. 15.

decided the matter. At once there was an outcry. Privileges were being attacked: the Common Law of the Church, which is for the good of the whole body, was considered of far less importance than the personal benefit of independence. The Benedictines, or at least their President, fearing lest certain shadowy rights should be interfered with by the Council of Trent, joined hands with the Jesuits in resisting the bishop. A manuscript work by Dom Rudisind Barlow, O.S.B., the President, known as the *Mandatum*,[1] was circulated; and *teste Panzani*[2] was brought to the knowledge of the Government through the Jesuits. Moreover, by the intrigues of Tobie Matthews, a petition was circulated among the laity, and on various pretexts some signatures were obtained to the effect that a bishop was not wanted.[3] The King was told that the bishop wished to set up a court for external jurisdiction, to prove wills and settle matrimonial cases, etc. All this was absolutely false; but the object was to set the Government against the bishop. The device succeeded. Two proclamations were issued for his arrest, and he was obliged to fly to France (1629), where he died in exile (1655).[4] The Jesuits procured a Breve, *Britannia*, which declared that as the regulars had apostolic authority, the leave or approbation of the ordinary "neither was nor is hereafter needful unto them."[5] This Breve is generally regarded as surreptitiously obtained; it does not

[1] The book was condemned at Rome as "scandalous and erroneous."

[2] Add. MS. 15,389. From this account it will be seen that the question of jurisdiction was not raised by the Benedictines.

[3] In this document, the *Declaratio Catholicorum Laicorum Angliæ circa auctoritatem quam Rev^mus Dominus Episcopus Chalcedonensis in eosdem vendicat et quæ ad hanc spectant acta* (Antwerp, 1631), the Jesuit faction profess to want bishops, but only such as they know could not possibly be in England at that time. They profess respect for Dr. Smith, inasmuch as he is a Catholic bishop sent by the Holy See to administer the sacrament of confirmation and to govern that part of the Clergy which, they think, is given to his care: but they were not going to recognise him as their ordinary. Already in 1627 they had presented a list of reasons against the bishop to the French ambassador Chateauneuf, in which they had protested against "such an authority being put upon their shoulders, and one that they could not obey."

[4] Dodd in his *Secret Policy of the English Jesuits* says: "Your clamours against him were so extravagant that they even scandalised the Archbishop of Canterbury, who couldn't imagine that such as maintained a divine institution in episcopacy should make use of so many stratagems to keep it from amongst them" (p. 215).

[5] Dodd, vol. iii. p. 160.

appear to have been considered valid, as it was never pro mulgated. That the Breve was got under false pretence is evident from the famous Bull *Plantata* for the Benedictine which was issued 12th July 1633 by the same Pope. Her the Benedictines, though exempt in certain matters, ar specially declared to be under the bishops in the cases lai down by the Council of Trent.

The Jesuits were once more free from episcopal contro Their numbers were continually upon the increase. The opened a second novitiate in London itself in 1628, and ha eighteen novices there. They instituted a Sodality in tow and held regular meetings; and to increase their wealth the took part in a soap manufactory at Westminster, under th names of some of their friends, Sir Basil Brooks among other That they were the real owners of this soap was well know about town; and in joke Londoners used to call it *Il Sapon Papistico*, so says Panzani.[1]

The Oath of Allegiance was still a burning questio Charles in vain made declarations which took away all re difficulties save the denial of the deposing power. This mad a very strong party among Catholics in its favour. They fe now that the former prohibition regarded a state of affai which no longer existed. Even some of the Jesuits connive at it and administered the sacraments to those who had take

[1] S. P. O. (*Roman Transcripts*) (Panzani Correspondence, 23rd February 163 It is worth while noticing the commercial instincts of the Society. Besides Parso successful venture with English cloth (see p. 137, *ante*) and this soap, we learn fr Ranke (ii. p. 392) that "the Jesuits held there was no material difference betwe the practice of agriculture, to which the more primitive monks had devoted themselv and the labours of commerce in which they engaged. The *Collegio Romano* posses a cloth manufactory at Macerata," first for their own use, then for all the oth colleges in the provinces, and lastly for the general public, "for which last purp they attended the fairs." They had also a general banking business. "Th commercial transactions were particularly prosperous in the colonies. The trad connections of the order extended, as it were, a network over both continents, hav Lisbon for its central point." In Rome they also sold pills, and, according to anot writer, the walls used to be placarded with advertisements about the efficacy of th purgatives. Benedict XIV. in 1740 interfered, but to little purpose. The bankrup of a mercantile house at Martinique, with which Fr. Lavallette was in connecti brought so much ruin upon some French merchants, that the scandal raised by repudiation of all liability by the General did a great deal to cause the suppress of the Jesuits in France.

it.[1] But Fr. Courtney *alias* Leedes, wrote a book against the Oath, and was imprisoned in consequence. His book was characterised as exceedingly weak, and the fallacy of his arguments were demonstrated by Dom Leander Jones, concerning which writer Courtney writes from prison: "I have seen the Gorgon-headed arrows of this kind shot at me by weak Leander and perfidious Widdrington."[2] But prison life was not agreeable to him, and at last (26th May 1636) he wrote: "For the future I shall be careful nevermore to endanger His Majesty's displeasure by accepting controversies or challenges of like nature."[3]

The attitude of the Society towards the bishop of course alienated the Clergy; and the bitterness was increased from day to day. Learning in the school of affliction the real value of things, a yearning for reunion with their separated brethren in the Anglican Church now began to manifest itself. The times seemed favourable; for there was a reaction taking place among the bishops of the Anglican Church, and High Church doctrines were appearing. A union between Rome and Canterbury did not then seem impossible, if the two parties could be brought into relations. Charles, under the Queen's influence, was not opposed, and Laud, the new Archbishop of Canterbury, had shown himself to be somewhat inclined to Catholicity, though whether from policy or religious motives does not exactly appear.

These disputes were perfectly well known to the authorities of the Established Church, who were not a little scandalised at the hatred of episcopacy displayed in those who believed in the Apostolic Succession. A correspondent of Laud, Thomas Williams, writing from Paris 30th August 1634, tells him that the Clergy were petitioning for the return of the Bishop of Chalcedon, and alleging many reasons, such as the need of confirmation and of some ruler for the Clergy. To take up his own words: "They alleged, thirdly, that a bishop was needful for the renewing of the wills and testaments of Catholics that died, in regard it is notorious that many Papists and Jesuits most ordinarily do apply unto them-

[1] S. P. O. Panzani Correspondence, 16th March 1635, Panzani to Barberini.
[2] Foley, vol. i. p. 261. [3] *Ibid.* p. 263.

selves those legacies and monies which be left to be distributed to poor Catholics, to the prejudice of the poor; which disorder would not be if there were a bishop to whose disposition the same might be referred.

"They alleged, fourthly, that there were many abuses committed secretly by religious men, and especially Jesuits in the government of their ghostly children, as well men as women; and in particular they avowed that the Society were wont to draw their penitents to make a certain blind obedience to them under pretext that the same is a rule of perfection to wit that they be obliged in conscience to obey their confessors in all things they shall enjoin them to do, relying upon his conscience and integrity, without examining whether the thing enjoined be good or bad, hurtful or profitable; and so proceed to the action without any further consideration, as if it were an oracle come from heaven: which is so notorious an abuse, that it oft times redounds to the great prejudice of princes in their persons and states. For what mischief will not many audacious men attempt, even upon the persons of Kings and Commonweals, where they be once thoroughly persuaded that what they enterprise is a work meritorious of heaven and pleasing to Almighty God? All which would be in great part remedied if they were but subject to the visit of a bishop who might thoroughly examine their doings and proceedings.

"On the other side, the Jesuits did allege that to re-send the said bishop into England were to disgust the King and the State, and raise a persecution against Catholics, when it might be avoided in his absence: also that it was no whit profitable for the Papists to have a bishop in England; but rather harmful, as experience hath made evident. As for Confirmation, the Papists may as well want it as they did all the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and a great part of the reign of King James; all which while the Papists were without a bishop and yet lived in greater unity among themselves than they do now.

"That the bishop was a very passionate and turbulent fellow, whose greatest endeavours, ever since he was a bishop have been to stir up and foster broils and debates between religious orders and priests and among lay Papists, so that he hath given cause of scandal to the Protestants and become

odious and intolerable; that he employed his industry to infringe the privileges of the religious orders, and specially of the Society of Jesus, to which he bore a great spite, and that these privileges, being granted them by so many Popes, if they should be weakened or limited by the authority of a bishop, would finally redound to the detriment of the See of Rome. These and many more reasons they brought, using all the friends they could, that the said bishop might return no more; so that the cause remained undetermined, and was put off till a further advice."

Williams then goes on to say "that the State of England hath now at present such an opportunity offered them to overthrow the Jesuits, as it will not perhaps have again, if this be let slip, in many years. Meanwhile, being let alone, they will proceed, prosper, and grow to be so many in number and so strong, that they will plainly reign; and then it will be hard, if not impossible, to prevail against them." He suggests that the Government should favour the Clergy and allow the return of the Bishop of Chalcedon, "a man, if there be any in the world, most obstinately bent against the Jesuits of this our country of England, and who would work their overthrow if he were but favoured by the State." According to the writer, who exaggerates somewhat, the English Jesuits had in their colleges more than five hundred and fifty young students, all paying from thirty pounds to forty pounds a year, "all children of the best Papists in England, whom they bring up in all those maxims of Jesuits, and mould their minds to their own"; and that "besides the revenues of their colleges beyond the seas, which are very great, they have here in England some two or three hundred thousand pounds sterling in yearly rents of lands, houses, and monies at use;—when you shall have considered there be at present more than 360 Jesuits in the land, dispersed throughout all the counties of the realm, and those of each county have their Rector, and above all those the Provincial; and that they have their private meetings four times yearly, where they not only order their own affairs, but discuss what is passed in court and country, and plot how they may further or hinder what may help or hurt them, and conclude 'this course we must run for our own interest, though it be to the ruin of a State.'" One

remarkable feature of the time struck the writer: the sma number of Jesuits, compared with the Clergy, who fell into th hands of the law. The secular priests that were taken b the pursuivant "are poor silly priests, who have scarce brea to put in their mouths, whereas the Jesuits, who are flush money and in wealthy Papists' houses, escape, as I observe while I was in England; and if any Jesuit be apprehende it is by chance, and he soon getteth loose; and now, go t your prisons and gaols, where priests be kept, and where yo shall find no Jesuits there, but only poor silly priests whic are scarce fit for aught else than to be in prison."[1]

Dom Leander Jones, President of the English Benedictine and an old college friend of Laud, was invited[2] by him (1634 to come over to England and discuss the situation. The Hol See agreed, and charged the monk with an informal missio to report upon the state of Catholics in England, and to d what he could to reconcile the dispute between the Clergy an the Regulars. Leander was a man of wide sympathies, a grav and learned theologian, but no party man. He was truly on desirous of peace. We have already in a former work dwe upon his mission and its results.[3] Here it will suffice to sa that he saw that, with the King's declaration, the Oath could i conscience be taken, and he urged the Holy See to allow i He also laboured successfully as a healer of the breach betwee most of the Regulars and the Clergy. In his reports to Rom he very plainly puts his finger on the sore place, and show that the Jesuits were the real disturbers of the common peac Naturally they set themselves up against him, and made a sorts of reports to Rome to damage his credit. These wer as he says, "but conjectures of curious brains."

Stricken down with his last disease, Leander rose from h sick-bed to attend a meeting where the Clergy and the repr sentatives of the Regulars agreed to terms of mutual concor Before his death he had recommended the Pope to sen another agent directly charged with a formal mission. H advice was followed, and on 25th December 1634 Gregor

[1] Clarendon State Papers, vol. i. pp. 38–41.
[2] Calendar of Clarendon State Papers, vol. i. p. 41.
[3] *The English Black Monks*, vol. ii. chap. xiv.

Panzani, a secular priest, landed in England to carry on Leander's work. How he fared must now be sketched.

At the end of last century Mr. Berington brought out *The Memoirs of Panzani*, and in return was attacked by an ex-Jesuit (it was just after the Suppression), Fr. Charles Plowden,[1] who could only meet the statements concerning the Society in England by saying that the manuscript Berington professed to use was a forgery, and by throwing doubt upon the existence of such a man as Panzani. However, among the Roman Transcripts in the State Papers Office and in the British Museum are to be found the whole of Panzani's correspondence during this agency, and very full it is, and vindicates the literary honesty of Dodd and Berington. From these sources we will give the story in so far as it touches upon our subject.

But first we must take the Jesuit account as given in the following guarded terms in the *Annual Letters* for 1635. It must be remembered that these Annual Letters are for the purpose of edifying, and they give but little information except that which can be published with safety. This silence is sometimes eloquent. "This year, too, the members of the Society suffered much from the attacks of enemies, whose envy was excited by their zealous labours in maintaining the Catholic faith and the interests of the Holy See. These persons desired their expulsion, but, failing in that, strenuously laboured to excite the ill-will of the King and Queen and of all parties against them. Against these attempts the superiors proceeded to act as far as might be done prudently and wisely. Being bound to vindicate their own and their subjects' character from calumnies fabricated against them, they defended themselves in writing with such moderation and prudence as to win the good opinion of all equitable men, and all who were not hopelessly prejudiced against them." This latter part is referring to some books written by Fr. John Floyd against the Bishop of Chalcedon, and by Fr. Matthew Knott, *alias* Wilson, the vice-

[1] The fate of all those who write history not partial to the Jesuits is the same. Dodd was met by Constable and Hunter; Berington by Plowden; Lingard was denounced to Rome; Tierney's work was stopped; Fr. Morris, S.J., whose training was external to the Society, was met by Fr. Zimmerman. History repeated itself lately and will probably do so in the immediate future.

provincial of the Jesuits. These books excited much opposition in France, and were answered by l'Abbé St. Cyran and his nephew, M. de Barcos (*Petrus Aurelius*). The works of the Jesuits were promptly condemned by the Sorbonne. They had discussed such points as the following: (1) *Whether episcopal government was necessary to make a church perfect?* (2) *whether the effect of the sacrament of confirmation, whereof the bishop is the minister, can be supplied by the anointing with chrism, performed by the priest in baptism?* (3) *whether bishops are necessary for anything, besides ordaining priests, and what is the dignity of curates?* (4) *whether religious are of the hierarchy, and whether their state and ministry is preferable to that of bishops and curates?* (5) *whether the Bishop of Chalcedon had the powers of ordinaries? whether the Regulars were obliged to obey him? and whether he could exact his salary from the Catholics of England?* The replies they made to these questions can readily be guessed. These works caused so much scandal in France, that the bishops summoned the French Jesuits to appear before them. The fathers disavowed the works of their English brethren, and expressed a strong wish that they had not been written. The Holy See in 1633 tried to suppress all writings on the subject. But it was impossible to suppress the result of these writings.

Writing to Barberini, nephew of the Pope (2nd February 1635), Panzani, after speaking of the necessity of a bishop being present in England, says: "It was requisite on account of the Regulars and the Clergy. For he found by experience that the Regulars, especially the Jesuits, were for being the sole proprietors of the mission; that they daily made new conquests and incorporated youths of the best families into their Society; that the Clergy were wormed out of their places and obliged to yield to the force of interest and money. Besides, many of the Regulars make themselves popular by pretended privileges and ill-grounded indulgences, and when they were questioned and desired to justify these singularities their answer is that some Pope granted them *vivâ voce*."[1]

On the question of reunion: "The Jesuits were not willing to hearken to an accommodation on the terms that were

[1] Berington, p. 150.

commonly proposed. Their usual language was that the Roman Catholic religion would never be restored in England but by the sword. This topic was very displeasing to Panzani. He told them very frankly, it had too great an affinity to the detestable contrivance of the Gunpowder Plot; but he was satisfied their zeal would never transport them so far. Their aversion to an accommodation was still more suspected from a book published by one of their order, *That Liberty of Conscience was not convenient for the English at the present Time.* Some enemies of the Jesuits thus paraphrased on it: That they (the Jesuits) judged it a more eligible state to remain as they were, than to see a total conversion of the nation with the detriment or exclusion of their body: the latter being much talked of and the first would certainly follow if the other orders were allowed their ancient claims, and the Jesuits be permitted to languish without lands, and by consequence without interest or power; whereas now, by methods peculiar to themselves, they bore up their heads above the rest."

The envoy gives his private impressions to his employer. He says: "It is but too true that some, and I may say many, both Jesuits and Benedictines, have turned the mission into a business of profit: of which abuse I see no other remedy than to cramp them in their faculties, especially the Jesuits. By this method they would not have so many followers and admirers. They would traffic less and attend more to the cure of souls. Avarice was the only motive that pushed them on to persecute the bishop. . . . I mention the Jesuits rather, because they are the leaders in the affair of the bishop; and it is the opinion of several Protestants that the Jesuits, upon I know not what view, do very much oppose a union at this time."[1]

Panzani transacted most of his business with Secretary Windebank, a protégé of Laud. The Jesuits, on the other hand, worked with Secretary Cottington. Windebank was no friend to the Jesuits, and told Panzani, "If we had neither Jesuits nor Puritans in England, I am confident a union might easily be effected." "As for the Jesuits," answered

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 152, 153.

Panzani, "though they have always been regarded as a learned body and very serviceable to the Church of Rome, yet it is no improbable but His Holiness would sacrifice their interest on the prospect of so fair an acquisition."[1] This, remarks Panzani, pleased the Secretary, for it showed him that the moderate men of the Church of Rome "had conceived a dislike to them on account of their aversion to episcopacy, which they treated with disrespect and viewed as inconsistent with their design of always being at the head."[2]

As to Windebank's idea concerning the Jesuits' motive for opposing a union, Panzani reports that it was because "the Jesuits were Spaniards by faction; that a union brought about by a French woman (the Queen) would tie France and England together in interest as in religion; and that the Spaniards must be sufferers by that event."[3] In reply to Panzani's defence that the body as a whole was innocent Windebank added warmly: "It is in vain to colour their proceedings: England is no stranger to their labours and inclinations: we have been many years acquainted with their artifices. The Church may subsist very well without them and why should a nation be pestered with them?"

In a letter from Barberini to Panzani (25th April 1635) the envoy is instructed to sound the King about sending another bishop in place of Dr. Smith; but the Cardinal warns him to use the greatest precautions lest the Jesuits should know of the proposal, as they would certainly traverse the design. But as regards banishing or reducing the number of Jesuits he was not to insinuate such things as practicable. The envoy had evidently been complained of; for in a letter (11th April 1635) to Barberini he says, that he will act more warily, yet he cannot without injuring truth and his own character conceal the behaviour of the Jesuits towards him. They say that his being sent over to England without their knowledge is an unpardonable fault. They have begun to stir Laud up against the idea of Catholic bishops in England, and publish everywhere that he was recalled and was only a spy on the nation. "The Jesuits are exasperated against me, thinking their credit much weakened by my coming over: for they usually make

[1] *Ibid.* p. 163. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.* p. 168.

the nation believe the Pope does nothing without their advice, especially in matters relating to religion." Later on (13th June 1635) he informs the Cardinal that the Jesuits have given out that he was not sent by the Pope, but by Richelieu: "So much are they perplexed to find themselves neglected at Rome on this occasion"; and he concludes this letter with these words: "Your Eminence must not be surprised that I complain so much and so often of the Jesuits, because I see plainly they are the only persons that cannot bear a bishop; and without question they will excite all their penitents against him. Every day I hear new complaints of them and of their equivocations; and yet I have given them more encouragement and tokens of confidence than to any others; which they requite with spreading idle and personal reflections, casting my horoscope and pretending to be privy to all the particulars of my life. And of late, one, Father Roberts, of that order attacked me so briskly on account of partiality in their disfavour, that I found myself obliged to make use of the strongest assertions to silence him."

In order to prevent the appointment of another bishop, the Jesuits had recourse to a device, already mentioned, which Panzani describes to the Cardinal in a letter dated 4th July 1635. Sir Basil Brooks came to him and placed in his hands the protestation of 1631 purporting to be signed by the laity. On inquiry Panzani found that several of the subscribers were scarcely Catholics at all, and that others refused to acknowledge their signatures; others said that they had signed because the bishop's power had been misrepresented to them, and they were told that his presence would bring about another persecution. "Does not your Eminence plainly see what tricks Brooks and the Jesuits play that I may be disappointed in speaking to their partisans and having the signatures verified?[1]

[1] Writing 9th February 1635, he had said: "The Jesuits, it is certain, do not wish for a bishop, fearing their privileges will be attacked. When I said I wanted specially to speak with their penitents who had written against the bishop, they said they were scattered over England. I am glad *Propaganda* has forbidden the sodality established by the Jesuits. They are vexed and cannot understand why people who only meet for spiritual exercises should be prevented. But for fifteen days the women used to meet and no one was allowed to go and see them by a Jesuit who talked according to the prudent custom of the Society."

At my first appearance in London they gave out to preven their adherents from coming near me, that I was a pensione of France and an agent of Cardinal Richelieu, also that a persecution was at hand, and that it was not prudent to visi me. Some patience is required to bear these men's reproaches They spare neither the Queen nor His Holiness nor you Eminence; and indeed you have affronted them withou measure in sending me hither without first having taken thei advice. One of their capital objections against me is that am not an impartial person, that is, that I am not wholl addicted to their domestic interests. For as they esteen their own proceedings just and reasonable, so all that fall no into their measures are wanting in their duty and are partia They have spread another report, namely, that I am ordere by your Eminence to apply myself no more to the Queen o Windebank; but rather to Mr. Cottington, the other Secretar of State, a great friend to the Catholics, but particularl addicted to the Jesuits' interests. In this they seem to hav a double view: first to set me at variance with Windeban and the Archbishop of Canterbury (who are professed adver saries to the Jesuits); then by Cottington's means to penetrat into my designs. Cottington is their friend and a Spaniar by faction."

We have referred to a meeting between the representa tives of the Clergy in the name of the Bishop of Chalcedo and the heads of the Regulars. It took place 17th Novembe 1635, and the following points were agreed to: "The partie mutually promise that they will unanimously attend to th common concerns of religion, and will aid one another as ofte as it may be wanted; nor will they, as far as depends upo themselves, suffer His Holiness to be imposed on by fals representations, or the honour and government of His Majest to be disturbed. To this end it is therefore resolved that a least every quarter and as often besides as may be occasio deputies from both sides shall meet for the purpose of deliber tion. But as His Holiness has deputed hither the Re Gregorio Panzani, it is our wish that he be requested to me our deputies in order that our reconciliation be made more fir and solemn. And if the members of other orders be disposed

join our union, we admit them to it." The following promises were made verbally: the Regulars promised that they would neither directly nor indirectly oppose the establishment of a bishop nor the peaceful exercise of his rights; and the Clergy on their part promised that the Regulars should enjoy unmolested all rights given by the Holy See. This agreement was signed by the Clergy, and by all the Regulars, with one significant exception. The Jesuits did not attend the meeting, and did not sign. They, however, knew of the meeting, for Panzani reports that one, Fr. Roberts,[1] called and expostulated with them upon the presence of the envoy. He was told that it was the united wish of the meeting that he or any other in the name of the Jesuits would sign the paper, in which a blank had been left for the purpose. The Jesuit got very angry, and said that the meeting was a conspiracy against his Society. He would not sign, but promised to report the matter to Blount, his Provincial.

A correspondence passed between Blount and Panzani. The Provincial (16th January 1636) refused point-blank to sign the agreement, and prayed that God would remove from the hearts of the Clergy the veil which the vain splendour of a hierarchy had drawn across their minds.[2] This conduct so offended the other deputies that they advised Panzani to importune him no longer, for that it made the Provincial put too great a value upon his agreement. But when Blount found that his refusal to sign gave scandal, he wrote a letter asserting his good intentions, but declining to sign the agreement upon most frivolous grounds; and in another (9th May 1636) he fell back upon the surreptitious Breve *Britannia*, which forbade all controversies between the Clergy and the Regulars, and so he held it would be better not to enter into any plan which would give rise to new disputes.

The Provincial always treated with Panzani through Fr. Roberts. This go-between told the envoy that the Jesuits had never opposed the Bishop of Chalcedon, but that the opposition had come from the laity.

[1] I cannot identify this Fr. Roberts. Can it be another *alias* for Knott *vere* Wilson?

[2] Dodd, vol. iii. p. 155.

When the news of this agreement got abroad, the Jesuits gave out that it was directed against their Society; and Panzani found that they were tampering with the other orders to get them to withdraw their signatures. Cottington, too, was used as a tool to further their end. He was told that the whole thing was a contrivance of the Italian envoy, and meant that a bishop, whom Charles had refused to allow, was to be introduced.

At last the Provincial seems to have signed some kind of compromise, which his subjects openly ridiculed. They had hopes that the former agreement would not be allowed at Rome. Fr. Philip, a French Jesuit, confessor to the Queen and a friend of Panzani's, told him that the English Jesuits were spreading abroad that it would not be allowed at Rome "because they are not mentioned as a party, and the Bishop of Chalcedon is introduced." Barberini reassured the envoy (31st July 1636), and tells him he is not to appear disturbed at what the Jesuits say in favour of themselves, they being a party concerned; but as for the agreement being ridiculed at Rome, it was all fiction and without ground. A mutual agency between England and Rome being now decided on,[1] Panzani was recalled at the end of 1636, and Conn, a Scotchman and private secretary to Cardinal Barberini, took his place. He seems to have worked more at individual conversions and in stimulating the Queen to encourage Charles to favour the Catholics. A great revival took place. Conn was then succeeded by Count de Rossetti (1639), whose agency was ended by the civil trouble which now broke upon Charles.

During the war that ensued the flock was scattered, with the result that records are scarce. What particular share the Jesuits at first took in the struggle we do not know; but the whirlwind sown by Parsons in the first part of the *Book of th*

[1] In the directions Charles gave to Brett, his agent at Rome, we read the following: "And for as much as we find the number of Jesuits increaseth daily here, who being for the most part practical and overbearing in matters of State, may become dangerous, and yet we are not willing, but upon great necessity, to use remedies which our laws do provide against them; you shall therefore use the best means you can for their revocation, that so this mischief may be prevented quietly and rather by the hand of that See than by ours, which must fall more heavily upon them, etc." (Clarendon State Papers, vol. i. p. 356).

Succession was now being reaped. His teaching against the divine right of kings found favour with the Puritans, and part of his book was now republished by order of the Parliament. With such views it is probable that the Jesuits would incline to the Puritan element in politics. It seems certain that in Cromwell's days (1655) they were in alliance with him, giving information about the French court and the Queen's court concerning all matters relating to England and himself.[1] During the expedition to Ireland (although Parliament had ordered that anyone giving shelter to a priest or to a Jesuit, even for a single hour, should lose his life and forfeit his property), a Jesuit, Fr. Nicholas Netterville, was on terms of great intimacy with Cromwell, often dining at his table and playing chess with him. When Captain Foulkes accused him of being a priest, he said, "I am a priest and the Lord General knows it, and (*you may*) tell all the town of it, and that I will say Mass here every day."[2]

Hyde writing in 1653 states that "Cromwell is said to have lately sent one Coleman,[3] a religious person, one Savage and another who is his kinsman, to the Pope to assure him of his good purposes towards the Catholics. The Jesuits are said to be very solicitous for Cromwell and to look for great matters from him when he shall make himself King."[4] In an official memoir of the period, the Jesuits are said to have never rendered any service to the King and always to have showed the greatest deference to Cromwell.

When the Pope sent over the Nuncio Rinuccini to Ireland (1645–49), the Jesuits there were amongst his opponents. Writing to Cardinal Panzirolo, 11th June 1647, he says that "a few days ago it was discovered that a heretic had attempted to induce the Commandant of Wexford Castle, by a gift of 1000 crowns, to give up the fort to the Prince as a place of landing. The Bishop of Ferns, then in the city, examined him and took his confession with that of ——, an English Jesuit, a man most pernicious in his influence upon the affairs of this kingdom";[5] and the next year (16th June 1648), after

[1] S. P. O. 1655, vol. 97, No. 63. [2] Gilbert's *History of Dublin*, vol. i. p. 56.

[3] I have not been able to find out who this Coleman was. Oliver in his *Collections* speaks of a Fr. Peter Coleman who was put to death by the Indians in 1685.

[4] Calendar State Papers, Charles II. vol. ii. p. 1365.

[5] *The Embassy in Ireland*, p. 294.

When the news of this agreement got abroad, the Jesuits gave out that it was directed against their Society; and Panzani found that they were tampering with the other orders to get them to withdraw their signatures. Cottington, too, was used as a tool to further their end. He was told that the whole thing was a contrivance of the Italian envoy, and meant that a bishop, whom Charles had refused to allow, was to be introduced.

At last the Provincial seems to have signed some kind of compromise, which his subjects openly ridiculed. They had hopes that the former agreement would not be allowed at Rome. Fr. Philip, a French Jesuit, confessor to the Queen and a friend of Panzani's, told him that the English Jesuits were spreading abroad that it would not be allowed at Rome "because they are not mentioned as a party, and the Bishop of Chalcedon is introduced." Barberini reassured the envoy (31st July 1636), and tells him he is not to appear disturbed at what the Jesuits say in favour of themselves, they being a party concerned; but as for the agreement being ridiculed at Rome, it was all fiction and without ground. A mutual agency between England and Rome being now decided on,[1] Panzani was recalled at the end of 1636, and Conn, a Scotchman and private secretary to Cardinal Barberini, took his place. He seems to have worked more at individual conversions and in stimulating the Queen to encourage Charles to favour the Catholics. A great revival took place. Conn was then succeeded by Count de Rossetti (1639), whose agency was ended by the civil trouble which now broke upon Charles.

During the war that ensued the flock was scattered, with the result that records are scarce. What particular share the Jesuits at first took in the struggle we do not know; but the whirlwind sown by Parsons in the first part of the *Book of th*

[1] In the directions Charles gave to Brett, his agent at Rome, we read the following: "And for as much as we find the number of Jesuits increaseth daily here, who being for the most part practical and overbearing in matters of State, may become dangerous, and yet we are not willing, but upon great necessity, to use remedies which our laws do provide against them; you shall therefore use the best means you can for their revocation, that so this mischief may be prevented quietly and rather by the hand of that See than by ours, which must fall more heavily upon them, etc." (Clarendon State Papers, vol. i. p. 356).

Succession was now being reaped. His teaching against the divine right of kings found favour with the Puritans, and part of his book was now republished by order of the Parliament. With such views it is probable that the Jesuits would incline to the Puritan element in politics. It seems certain that in Cromwell's days (1655) they were in alliance with him, giving information about the French court and the Queen's court concerning all matters relating to England and himself.[1] During the expedition to Ireland (although Parliament had ordered that anyone giving shelter to a priest or to a Jesuit, even for a single hour, should lose his life and forfeit his property), a Jesuit, Fr. Nicholas Netterville, was on terms of great intimacy with Cromwell, often dining at his table and playing chess with him. When Captain Foulkes accused him of being a priest, he said, "I am a priest and the Lord General knows it, and (*you may*) tell all the town of it, and that I will say Mass here every day."[2]

Hyde writing in 1653 states that "Cromwell is said to have lately sent one Coleman,[3] a religious person, one Savage and another who is his kinsman, to the Pope to assure him of his good purposes towards the Catholics. The Jesuits are said to be very solicitous for Cromwell and to look for great matters from him when he shall make himself King."[4] In an official memoir of the period, the Jesuits are said to have never rendered any service to the King and always to have showed the greatest deference to Cromwell.

When the Pope sent over the Nuncio Rinuccini to Ireland (1645–49), the Jesuits there were amongst his opponents. Writing to Cardinal Panzirolo, 11th June 1647, he says that "a few days ago it was discovered that a heretic had attempted to induce the Commandant of Wexford Castle, by a gift of 1000 crowns, to give up the fort to the Prince as a place of landing. The Bishop of Ferns, then in the city, examined him and took his confession with that of ——, an English Jesuit, a man most pernicious in his influence upon the affairs of this kingdom";[5] and the next year (16th June 1648), after

[1] S. P. O. 1655, vol. 97, No. 63. [2] Gilbert's *History of Dublin*, vol. i. p. 56.

[3] I have not been able to find out who this Coleman was. Oliver in his *Collections* speaks of a Fr. Peter Coleman who was put to death by the Indians in 1685.

[4] Calendar State Papers, Charles II. vol. ii. p. 1365.

[5] *The Embassy in Ireland*, p. 294.

excommunicating the Ormonde faction, the Nuncio complains that "the Jesuits have been the authors of the assertion, which they defend with the utmost arrogance, that the excommunication cannot take effect; and have induced the Bishop of Kilkenny not to promulgate the interdict."[1] And on 4th July in the same year he writes: "The Jesuits, as usual devoted to their own interests, have declared against us."[2]

During the earlier part of the Civil War several Jesuits paid the penalty of their priesthood by death. Fr. Ralph Corbie suffered at Tyburn 17th September 1644; Fr. Thomas Harrison at Lancaster in 1650; Fr. Holland at Tyburn 22nd December 1642; Fr. Morse at the same place on 1st February 1645; and Fr. Peter Wright followed them 19th May 1651.

During the times of the Civil Wars there is a great dearth of information. Papers got lost and missions were broken up. But from the *Annual Letters* of 1652 we get an interesting account "of an endeavour made by Fr. Cuthbert Clifton, and it would seem with success, to reconcile to the Church the Earl of Derby, when he was already condemned to death for his attachment to the Royal Cause, and on his way to the town of Bolton, which had been assigned for the place of execution. At this critical time Fr. Clifton conceived or was inspired with the desire of bringing this loyal and gallant nobleman before he died to a salutary acknowledgment of the higher allegiance which he owed to God and His Church. Yielding to this impulse, he hastened to the station at which the Earl, accompanied by his son and suite and guarded by a strong military escort, was to pass the night; and it being intimated that the party should reach Bolton the next day, by means of a friend who had much influence with the commanding officer, he obtained access to the Earl's chamber. Having introduced himself by the name of Norris, he expressed a wish to be allowed to speak to the Earl in private for a short time upon a subject of great value, which it most concerned him to dispose of before his death. He was desired to call again the next morning. He did so, and was again put off by the guards with design apparently, as though they suspected something wrong. At length the order to start was given, and the father

[1] *Ibid.* p. 399. [2] *Ibid.* p. 404.

was told that he might find an opportunity of speaking to the Earl on the road. He joined the cavalcade, and riding as near to the noble prisoner as he could, tried to attract his notice. The Earl observing him, kindly asked him to come and ride by his side. The father, making himself known, hastened to say that the object which he wished him to dispose of properly before his death, was his immortal soul. The Earl said he had suspected something of the kind the evening before, and expressed great gratitude to the father for thus exposing himself for his sake. The father briefly and forcibly urged the great principle of faith. The Earl said that he agreed with the Catholics with respect to the Blessed Trinity, the veneration due to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, and the doctrine of Purgatory; that he was so well disposed towards the Catholic religion, that he had resolved, if he had lived, to examine thoroughly into it; that he thought the differences between Catholics and Protestants were not of great importance, but that he could not thus suddenly and on the point of death abandon the Church to which he had been attached all his life. The father tried to overcome his repugnance, though often interrupted by the approach of the guards. Seeing the Earl's Protestant chaplain advance, who had left the halting-place of the preceding night later than the rest of the party, he besought the Earl, by the sufferings and death of his Redeemer, not to resist the grace afforded to him. The guards and attendants now closed round, and the father was obliged to retire. Yet he kept as near as he could, fervently praying for the success of his attempt. They had arrived within a mile of Bolton, when the Earl turned round and called for Mr. Norris. The attendants made way, and the father was again at the Earl's side, who now at once declared that he received every part of the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and professed himself a member of it, and as such was ready to confess all his sins and perform whatever penance should be enjoined, asking earnestly for absolution. The father having done what circumstances permitted, was about to pronounce absolution, when the Earl reverently uncovered his head to receive it. The father instantly desired him to be covered, and completed the sacramental rite. When all was concluded,

the Earl turned round with a smiling countenance and rejoined the company of his son and attendants.

"On entering the town, he saw the scaffold, and observed with a smile that it was his cross, and that he willingly embraced it. When the party halted, the Earl desired his son and attendants to retire outside for a while, and declining the proffered ministry of the chaplain, remained nearly an hour in private and fervent prayer. As he went out, he repeatedly said to those about him that he was most grateful to the Divine Goodness for having enabled him to set his conscience at ease before his death . . . One of the officers asked him to declare that he died a Protestant. He took no notice of the suggestion, as if he had not heard it. It was repeated more pointedly, when he answered that he had reconciled himself with God by His great goodness, and hoped to be saved through the merits of Christ . . . and invoking His holy name, he laid his head on the block and by one stroke it was severed from his body."[1]

The question of the wealth possessed by the English Jesuits is naturally one about which much information is wanting. However, we get in the year 1645 the annual report of the Provincial, which was meant for circulation among the superiors of the various provinces of the Society. That particular year was characterised as one of "extreme need," as the Civil War made it impossible for the friends in England of the Society to continue pecuniary assistance. And yet we learn that the clear available income of the entire English Province at home and abroad was 17,405 scudi. Calculating the scudo at 4s. 6d., we get £3916, 2s. 6d., which equals in present money, taking the value as three times higher,[2] about £11,748, 7s. 6d. The amount was calculated to support 243 persons, but actually maintained 335, which in present money is at the rate of £35, 1s. 4½d. a head instead of £48.

We must not forget to mention that about this time the English Jesuits in their zeal for spreading the gospel under

[1] Foley, vol. ii. pp. 9–11.

[2] This is Foley's estimate, which is too low. It should probably be six times higher. In which case the sum would equal to £35,245, 2s. 6d.

took a mission to Maryland. On 25th or 26th March 1634 Lord Cecil Baltimore, with Fr. Andrew White, three other English Jesuit priests, one lay brother, together with two hundred settlers, landed in Maryland, to find that freedom of conscience which was denied them at home. After ten years of labour White was seized by a band of soldiers who had invaded the colony from Virginia, and was carried off in chains to London, where he was tried for his life, in that he, a Jesuit and a priest, dared to be in England. However, he had no difficulty in showing that his presence in England was by no means voluntary. He saved his life, but was banished the kingdom.

When Dr. Richard Smith died in 1655, the Clergy petitioned for another bishop, and Alexander VII. promised to appoint one within seven months. Meanwhile he left the government in the hands of the Chapter. Here was another opportunity for the Jesuits to interfere in the English ecclesiastical polity. A rumour was spread about Rome that if a bishop were granted, Cromwell had said he would send a fleet into the Mediterranean and bombard Civita Vecchia. Cardinal Albechi was chief of the congregation entrusted with English affairs. "He was a great admirer of the Jesuits, and the only one in Rome," says Sergeant, "ever known to speak or act in the least against our Chapter."[1] So the matter was stayed.

Before closing this chapter it will be well to take notice of a book published in 1629, which assuredly influenced the Jesuit policy in the time of James II. Adam Contzen of the Society, and a professor at Munich, brought out a large folio: *Politicorum Libri Decem in quibus de perfectæ reipublicæ forma, virtutibus et vitiis.* We are only concerned with the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters, which treat of the manner of reducing people to the true religion. The work is to be accomplished by degrees; the chief heretics and teachers of errors are to be banished, at once, if possible; and the same methods are to be used which the Calvinist found efficacious against the Lutherans in Germany. These were: secrecy as to the ultimate design, at least as far as the people were concerned; a pretence of toleration of liberty of conscience on

[1] P. 85.

the part of the prince; moderation in handing over churches t the opposite party; conferences to satisfy objections; proclama tions that neither party should cast aspersions on the other pretence of peace; silence to all remonstrances, while calumn was freely used; when the moment was ripe for action, a adversaries were to be deposed from their charges, and th churches bestowed on their opponents; scholars at the uni versities were to be practised on with divers arts, and professor refused the royal protection. Other means suggested by th Jesuit were: that all adverse to the Roman Catholic religio were to be ousted from their honours, dignities, and publi offices; strife to be stirred up among the various sects; a secret and all public meetings to be strictly forbidden; and b severe laws and punishments the obstinate were to be com pelled to submit. The writer adds: "It is, I allow, th opinion of some politicians that men are not to be compelled But those who so advise are in error, and give counsel not onl against the safety of Religion but also against the common weal; since by a wholesome law men may be overruled s that they may not do evil; and a good law will soon reduc such, as being of tender years, are either not at all or ver little tainted with heresy. And so if a compulsory reforma tion does no good to old men, it will make the younge generation Catholic." Before marriage, men and women wer to give an account of their faith, and to receive instructions only Catholic baptisms and burials allowed; and while th differences existing between the preachers of error were to b kept up so that they might often confer and wrangle, prefe ments were to be given to unmannerly men "for by tha means error will grow into contempt."

The methods advocated in this book savour more o worldly intrigue than of the gospel of Christ; but it accuratel represents the prevalent tone. Such were the new method of propagating Christianity, and in them we find much o the same spirit that Parsons displays in his *Memorial for th Reformation of England.*

CHAPTER XV

THE GOLDEN DAY

WHEN Charles II. was restored, the good services of his faithful Catholic subjects both at home and abroad demanded recognition. Soon after the Restoration a meeting was convened, in June 1661, at Arundel House, at which a petition to the House of Lords was drawn up, asking for toleration. All seems to have been going on well, when some one in the House suggested that it might be granted on the condition that the Jesuits were excluded. Having at stake the welfare of the body at large, this condition, all things considered, was not altogether unacceptable to the English Clergy. But the Jesuits protested energetically; and in a paper preserved in Kennet's *Register and Chronicle* the objections and their answers are preserved. From it we take the following:—

"First, it is objected that the Jesuits teach the doctrine of the Pope deposing kings. It is answered, that no community can less be accused of that doctrine than the Jesuits. It is true, four or five Jesuits did many years ago teach that doctrine as they found it taught by others ancienter than their Order. But since the 1st of January 1616 the General of the Jesuits forbade any of his to teach, preach, or dispute for that doctrine, or print anything for it, to take away the aspersion which the writings of some few have brought upon the Society; and now actually all Jesuits are obliged, under pain of damnation, not to teach that doctrine either in word, writing, or print; which none in the Church but only they are."[1]

Their behaviour regarding the Oath of Allegiance, which really was concerned about this very point, and their subse-

[1] P. 496.

quent action in this reign, are a curious commentary upon th declaration, and prove that at anyrate they held the doctrine

The Provincial at that time was Father Edward Courtne *alias* Leedes, who had been imprisoned for writing against t Oath in the days of Charles I. He now by his address averte the danger threatening the English Jesuits,[1] "by his wisdom a industry, and especially assisted by a vow he made in hono of St. Francis Xavier. He was also involved in other mo difficult times and intricate affairs, but conquered all by h indomitable perseverance and firmness." So say the *Annu Letters* for 1677. Some of his letters to the General have be preserved. In one (6th April 1663) he says that the same an Catholic feeling of hostility existed amongst the Commons in the time of Charles I. The Jesuits were especially favour "by the Lord Chancellor and other leading nobility," and t former had spoken out boldly in the third Parliament in the behalf. But the Commons were clamouring for more la against Catholics, and for the expulsion of all priests a Jesuits. The coming storm was beginning to rumble.

Father Courtney early in May (1662) went "to make h visitation in the counties nearest to the sea-coast, to be rea on any given signal of the Queen's arrival to hasten to t port."[2] Catherine of Braganza was on her way to wed Charl The design the Provincial had in hand was "to present H Majesty with the respects of the English Society, and th prayers for every prosperity upon her first arrival. Anoth reason of his journey is to congratulate the Portuguese fathe coming with her, on their arrival."[3] The real reason was keep Catherine firm to her resolution to be married only Catholic rites.

Charles had a desire to reunite his kingdom to the Ho

[1] The Jesuits found a strong advocate in the person of the so-called Janse d'Aubigny. Charles, following the example of his French brother monarch, sti lated that all priests should give in their names to the Secretary of State, and that one should be allowed to exercise any function except under the authority of official the King should appoint for this purpose. The condition which d'Aubi seems to have proposed for the Jesuits was that they should have an English Gene and renounce him of Rome (see *Port Royal par Sainte-Beuve* (ed. 5), vol. iv. 557, 558).

[2] Foley, vol. iv. p. 277.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 278.

See, and as a first step took advantage of Secretary Belling's journey to Rome on private affairs, to open negotiations with Pope Alexander VII. to secure the promotion of his kinsman d'Aubigny to the cardinalate. Instructions, dated 25th October 1662, were given to Belling, and the King signed each page. They ran to the effect that the promotion would benefit the whole country; whilst giving the Catholics a head, the King would secure a trusty agent. This step, Charles said, was absolutely necessary for bringing about a good understanding with the Pope, and for securing the welfare of the Catholics in England. He also promised to find the money for the new Cardinal's support. Rome refused the petition. D'Aubigny was said to be a favourer of the Jansenists. Although Oliva, the Vicar-General of the Jesuits, seems to have favoured Belling's petition, and this for a reason that will appear, the only answer that could be obtained was the same one that Clement VIII. had made to James I.: "What are you going to do for the Catholics?" In a paper drawn up in reply, it was mentioned among other good deeds and intentions of the King, that he had given most gracious audience to two Jesuit Provincials, and promised them his royal patronage. Charles, indeed, at that time seems to have been seriously thinking of declaring himself a Catholic. In a profession of faith which he sent to Oliva, he accepted all the teaching of the Council of Trent and the late decrees about Jansenism. But he reserved to himself the rights, claimed also by the French King, of accepting or refusing decrees of future Councils which went beyond the creed of Pius IV. While he would tolerate Protestantism, he promised to put back the ecclesiastical hierarchy into the position it was in 1534, to establish parishes, seminaries, and synods, and to introduce and favour religious orders.

But if Charles intended to form his Catholicity on the Gallican model, Rome would have none of it; and so the negotiations came to an end. But the King was at that time in cordial relations with the General of the Jesuits. A royal bastard, known as James Stuart, or De la Cloche, became a Jesuit novice in Rome 11th April 1668; and there exists an interesting correspondence between the King and Oliva

respecting him. Writing 3rd August 1668, Charles, afte saying he was anxious for his soul's welfare, suggests that hi son should be brought over secretly to England to confes him and administer the sacraments to him. On the sam day he wrote to his son inviting him to England, and cor gratulating him on becoming a Jesuit, and at the same tim he expressed his regret that he could not openly show hi goodwill to the Society. The King sent £800 for the suppor of his bastard, and promised to send money for the nev buildings the Jesuits were erecting at St. Andrea on th Quirinal. The son did come to England, and afterward returned to Rome. His after-history seems uncertain.[1]

In 1669 the members of the Province amounted to tw hundred and sixty-six, one hundred and twenty-two bein employed in England. Fr. Emmanuel Lobb was Provincia and, in this year, secured a convert in the person of Jame Duke of York, who had for a long time been thinking c taking such a step, but thought that he could obtain dispensation to become a Catholic without leaving th Established Church. Of course the Jesuit told him such licence was impossible, and the Pope, to whom James wrot on the subject, gave the same reply. He, then, became Catholic, and his subsequent marriage with Maria d'Este wa the signal for a Protestant panic. The next heir to th throne was a Catholic, and what could that mean but th subversal of the Established Church?

That there were abundant grounds for this feeling, beside the fact of James becoming a Catholic, is clear not only fro what he said but also by a brief consideration of Charles' ope religious policy. On 1st May 1660 by the Treaty of Bred he had declared "a liberty to tender consciences, and that n man should be disquieted or called in question for difference of opinion in matters of religion which did not disturb th peace of the kingdom." He promised also the royal assent t such Acts of Parliament as should be offered for the fu granting of that indulgence. But once on the throne Charl could not forget his old enemies the Puritans, and they wer now persecuted for refusing to conform to the Establishe

[1] Boero, *Istoria della Conversione alla Chiesa Cattolica di Carlo II. Rè d'Inghilterr*

Church. The Corporation Act of 1661 compelled all bearers of office in corporate towns to take "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England"; and on 24th August 1662 nearly two thousand rectors were driven from their parishes for resisting the renewed Act of Uniformity. The doctrine of non-resistance to the King's will was now the favourite teaching of the Anglican divines, and men were called upon to allow that the King's right was so exalted that to question it was a damnable crime.[1] This, of course, was the rebound from the position taken up by the Puritans, who, though for the moment held in check, could not forget Marston Moor or Naseby, where the divine right of the people was asserted. They watched with alarm Charles' attitude towards Catholics and his friendship with Louis XIV., then at the height of his splendour. Although forced to join the Triple Alliance of 1668, which bound England to Sweden and Holland in resisting France, Charles was on the watch for an opportunity of joining the French King, and obtaining by his means the freedom from the power of Parliament, which stood as an unyielding obstacle to the assertion of his claims. Charles wanted to substitute Cabinet for Parliamentary Government. His ministers he would either outwit or bring over to his views. Two of them, Arlington and Clifford, were, like the King, Catholics in heart. In January 1669 they were summoned with the Duke of York and two Catholic nobles, Lords Bellasis and Arundel, to a conference[2] in which Charles, after pledging them to secrecy, declared himself a Catholic, and asked their counsel as to the means of establishing the Catholic religion in his realms. It was resolved to apply to Louis for aid in this purpose. Charles proceeded to seek from that King a "protection of which he always hoped to feel the powerful effects in the execution of his design of changing the present state of religion for a better, and of establishing his authority so as to be able to restrain his subjects in the obedience they owe him." Charles offered to declare his religion and to join

[1] This seems like the application of the principle: *Perinde ac cadaver.*

[2] Secretary Coleman's Secret Treaty in 1669 with the Jesuit confessor of the French King, Père La Chaise, must not be forgotten.

France in an attack upon Holland, and support her claims to Flanders, if Louis would grant him a subsidy equal to a million a year. A secret treaty was signed at Dover, May 1670, which provided that Charles should announce his conversion, and that in case of any disturbance arising from such a step, he should be supported by a French army and a handsome subsidy.

Charles temporised. He shrank from the condition of announcing his conversion, but declared war against Holland, and, on 15th March 1672, issued the Declaration of Indulgence. This allowed freedom to Dissenters, and permitted Catholics to be free from the penalties of the law as long as they contented themselves with practising their religion in private. Suspicions were aroused: and Parliament in 1673, now fighting for its very existence, denounced the Declaration which dared to set aside the law. Even Dissenters refused to accept the gift, partly because it was unlawful and partly because the hated Catholics would share in it. The King had to give way and withdraw it. Parliament now followed up its victory with the Test Act, which excluded from office all who refused to abjure the dogma of Transubstantiation. This, then, was the position of religious history at the time, and it will explain the real cause of subsequent events which concerned the English Jesuits.

The *Annual Letters* for 1673 tell us that in London there were twenty-four Jesuits, and that some of the fathers were occupied in the private duties of the Order or in their more immediate missionary work for the good of souls. Two directed the Queen and two the Duchess of York; while three more were engaged in procuratorial duties. The rest lived with private families. The Provincial in 1678 was Father Thomas Whitbread, and while making his visitation in Flanders there came to him one asking for admission into the Society. But hearing that the postulant already had been expelled from two of the colleges,[1] the Provincial refused him admission. This was none other than the redoubtable Protestant champion Dr. Titus Oates, who was already preparing his famous plot.

Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, was the

[1] Valladolid and St. Omer.

chief and leader of the anti-Catholic party; and it was under his auspices that the plot was formed.[1] When the Test Act was introduced, he and others of his following "prepared Parliament and the nation by the increased fervour of their zeal against Popery to apprehend some impending evil that called for more than ordinary vigilance and violence of language and factious conduct to avert. In the month of August 1678 Dr. Titus Oates made his first appearance on the stage of Shaftesbury theatre in the character of 'a Saviour of the Nation,' introduced by another reverend performer, one Dr. Tonge, Rector of St. Michael's Church, London. The piece for performance was 'The Popish Plot.' The people applauded it highly; for two years it kept its ground.

"The plot turned on the killing of the King, the overthrow of the Protestant religion in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the substitution of the Duke of York or some other Catholic prince for the reigning King Charles, and likewise of the Popish religion for the Established faith. The King was to be taken off either by poison administered by his physician, Sir George Wakeman, or by being shot by a Jesuit lay-brother and another person named Honest William, or by two other sets of assassins, two Benedictine monks, and four Irishmen of names unknown. The plot was said to be originally contrived and so far put into execution by the order of the Jesuits. The Provincial in England was the principal agent, and several Catholic noblemen his aiders and abettors."[2]

Such was the plot which for two years threw the English nation into a state of frenzy. Their usual common sense forsook them; and the wildest stories, the more improbable the better, were eagerly believed. On 13th August, Tonge waited on the King with a copy of a paper which he said had been thrust under his door by some unknown person. It contained forty-three counts, which, four days after, were increased to eighty-one. The King laughed at the idea. Hints were given that treasonable papers would arrive by post at Windsor

[1] He had at first seconded Charles in his plea for Toleration. But deceived by the King, who had promised that Catholics should not benefit by such a measure, Ashley withdrew. He had learnt, in a moment of drunken confidence, the secret of the King's conversion, and now he became Charles' embittered opponent.

[2] Madden's *History of the Penal Laws*, p. 204.

addressed to Fr. Mumford *alias* Bedingfield, chaplain to the Duke of York. The prophets were true in this case. Mumford going to the Post Office did find letters for him written in a strange hand, and signed with the names of the Provincial and other Jesuits in London. The contents were to the effect that the great affair should be executed on the first opportunity, but without knowledge of the Duke. Wisely the letter was at once handed to James to show it to the King, who remarked, "I have known this for a month past."

Meanwhile Oates was going about among Catholics under various pretexts, and called upon the Provincial who had been already warned by Mumford that some mischief was brewing by the forged letters. Oates was sharply received and charged with being the author, and says in one of his examinations, that the Jesuit beat him with his stick and gave him a box on the ear, with orders to go off to St. Omer within a fortnight.[1]

Seeing that they were suspected, Oates and Tonge went before Sir Edmundbury Godfrey, a magistrate, and swore to the truth of the information already laid before the King. Within three weeks' time, that is to say on 28th September, Oates was summoned before the Privy Council to tell his tale the next day. Charles saw him and cross-examined him himself, and, having found him out in notorious contradictions, told his Council, "This is a most lying scoundrel." The Council thought that there must be some foundation in reality for such a story, and demanded documentary proof, which Oates promised should be forthcoming if he had warrants and officers to arrest the persons and papers of those he accused. This was granted. At once several Jesuits were seized—Fr. Ireland, the procurator, Fr. Fenwick, and Pickering,[2] a Benedictine lay-brother. They were taken off to Newgate. The Provincial Whitbread, together with another father, were captured the next day in the house of Count Egmont, the Spanish ambassador; but, on the urgent expostulation of the ambassador, who promised to produce them when called

[1] Foley, vol. v. p. 106.

[2] The very idea of associating a Benedictine lay-brother with so-called Jesuit plots is a clear proof of the vivid imagination of Dr. Oates.

From Popery to save this Nation
A Doctor ventures his Damnation –

Commits Idolatry for our sakes
And of false Oaths noe scruple makes.

The Popes Chiefe Agent was too poor
He Regd an Almes at Pickerins dore

Pickerin had kild the King, noe doubt
But Bullets lost, and Flint dropt out –

Since naught but blowes is to be got
Wise Oates discovers Iesuits Plot.

His Eues are dim, by Candle light
And a groaning saint does not swear right

Tarsbrough hides Armes, in open Roomes
A Knight in his Fore Fathers Tombes.

An other where noe man would thinke
Gunpowder hides, in filthy sinke.

Our Doctor he does trudgell hastily
And dare you stays he to my face lye.

They life and many, All refuse
The fatal Rope, they freely choose.

And to be cut into four Quarters
Cause they'd be Canoniz'd for Martirs.

HELLISH POPISH PLOT. PART II.

Broadside by Fairthorne

upon, they were allowed to remain; but all their papers were seized. Others were apprehended, and various Catholic gentlemen mentioned by Oates were also taken. The news caused a great commotion, and there was a universal cry against not only Jesuits, but every priest and lay Catholic. The long-pent-up hatred against them now burst forth in all its violence. The Spanish treasons and the Gunpowder Plots were recalled to inflame the Protestant mind more and more, and to give a certain semblance of probability to the discoveries of Dr. Oates. The universal horror was increased by the discovery of Sir Edmundbury Godfrey's body in a ditch on Primrose Hill, pierced through and through with his own sword. A Jesuit contemporary account says: "Reports were immediately circulated to the effect that the money upon his person was untouched, and the only thing missing was a small book in which he had written the chief heads of Oates' plot against the Catholics. Hence the faithful were accused of being the murderers. All were sought out for death. Preachers declaimed from the pulpits, speakers did so from the platform, news-vendors reported throughout the taverns and public places of resort that the Papists were, without doubt, the authors of the crime, and that the lives of all Protestants were in danger. They loudly demanded investigation, seeing that such proofs of papistical ferocity were now come to light. Ballads in the same strain were sung throughout the streets, and printed sheets everywhere exposed for sale. 'An offering must be made of Papists by the hands of the magistrates. The door-post on which a mark was affixed should be converted into a gallows,' and other equally savage expressions. The history of the massacre of St. Bartholomew was printed, and any act of cruelty recounted by historians, true or false, was attributed to the Catholics of the day, as though they had been events of recent occurrence."[1]

The whole country was fanned into a blaze; and when Parliament was opened Charles gave way to the excited public opinion, and said in his speech, "he had heard that the Jesuits had conspired against his life, but on that matter he wished to be silent, and leave the affair in the hands of justice." The

[1] *Annual Letters.*

House of Commons, after hearing Oates in person, formally declared that a plot for the murder of the King and of all Protestants actually existed; and the House of Lords followed suit. New laws against Catholics were quickly passed, and the King consented that the two Houses should take such steps as their united wisdom considered necessary for the protection of the Protestant religion.

Now came upon the scene another scoundrel to support Oates. Bedloe stated on oath that Sir Edmundbury had been strangled at Somerset House by certain priests in the very presence of the Queen, who was also accused of attempting, by the advice of three Jesuits, to poison the King.

After many months' imprisonment, the unfortunate Jesuits, Ireland, together with Pickering and John Groves (Honest William), were placed at the bar on 17th December 1678, on the charge of high treason; but as only Oates appeared as a witness, the case was adjourned. It is not necessary to go into the details of the trials. No one, at this date, believes in the guilt of the accused; and Oates with his fellow-plotters have been condemned to a well-merited infamy. But such was the popular feeling, that although his testimony was full of clear contradictions and absurd statements, he was believed. He stated among other wild assertions that he, an outsider, was admitted to a meeting of the Jesuits which was concerned solely with their own internal affairs, and that he had received authority from the General to open their letters. On the very day he mentioned he was proved by a number of witnesses to have been at St. Omer, though he brought witnesses to disprove the *alibi*. Everything that could be brought in defence of the accused weighed nothing with Chief Justice Scroggs, who made a vehement tirade against the Catholic faith as the source of all treachery and iniquity, and so worked upon the minds of the jury that they brought in in each case a verdict of guilty. Fr. Ireland and John Groves suffered at Tyburn, 3rd February 1679. Fathers Whitbread, Waring, Turner, and Gavan were tried on 22nd June 1678, and executed on 30th June. The thirst for blood was appeased, and gradually the people realised they had been duped by men who sought their own political ends regardless of means. Twenty-six

persons died on the scaffold, four in prison, and thirty others were condemned but reprieved.[1]

Charles seems to have felt great remorse at these executions. From a letter to the General (3rd April 1685) the Queen-Dowager is reported to have said, "that the King never entered her boudoir (where after their execution she kept suspended the portraits of the Jesuit fathers who were martyred in the feigned conspiracy) but that the said King, her husband, would turn towards them, and, kissing their hands, would beg their forgiveness in the most humble manner, and full of sentiments of repentance would make a most hearty protestation of his fault and of their innocence, concluding by saying that they were in a place where they knew of a truth that he had been forced, and that they would therefore pray to God for Him to pardon his crime."[2]

The question of the Oath of Allegiance again cropped up about this time, and the Jesuits returned to their former attitude. It was all the more advisable, as the heir to the throne was a Catholic; and under their influence they thought it more than probable that the obnoxious Oath would be repealed. At a provincial meeting held at Ghent in 1681 the following resolutions were passed: "In order to secure uniformity among us in reference to the Oath of Allegiance, as it is called—(1) We all profess that as great obedience and allegiance towards our King shall be sincerely sworn and displayed by each of us, as is usually sworn and displayed by other Catholic subjects whomsoever to their princes. (2) It is impossible that the Oath of Allegiance, as now interspersed with many heretical clauses, can be accepted, having been condemned by many Breves of the sovereign pontiffs. (3) If any shall publicly teach, contrary to the decrees of the Holy See, that the Oath is lawful, they are not to be admitted to absolution without public recantation made or solemnly promised, and all are to be cautious in absolving or not absolving those who cause scandal."[3]

Charles died 16th February 1685, and the hopes of the Jesuits were at last realised. A King of their own sat upon

[1] Dodd, vol. iii. pp. 399, 400. [2] Foley, vol. v. p. 93.
[3] Quoted from the Brussels State Paper Office by Foley, vol. v. p. 80, note.

the throne.[1] The Golden Day was surely at hand. The time for which Parsons and his brothers had worked for the last hundred years had arrived, and now, with a King addicted to their Society, the plans and proposals made by the great Jesuit had a chance of being realised.

One of the new monarch's first steps was to call to his side a Jesuit priest, Fr. Edward Petre, to make him head of the Chapel Royal at St. James'. The King appointed for his residence the rooms which, as Duke of York, he himself had occupied. Petre was made Clerk of the Closet. The Catholics came out of their hiding-places, and the Jesuits summoned extra workers from the Continent to carry in the expected harvest. James set himself to propagate the Catholic religion by every means in his power; and knowing that Parliament in its present temper would not repeal the laws against his co-religionists, he made flagrant use of the dispensing power which the Stuarts claimed as kings by right divine, and opened negotiations with Rome. His confessor, Fr. Warner, in his MS. history, says: "Things being thus settled within the realm, the next care His Majesty had was to unite his country's to the obedience of the Bishop of Rome and the Apostolic See, which had been cut off by heresy about an age and a half before. To try the Pope's inclination, in the year 1685, he sent Mr. Caryll thither, who succeeded according to his wishes, and, being recalled, the Earl of Castlemain was sent the next year as Extraordinary Ambassador to the Pope in the name of the King and the Catholics of England, to make their submission to the Holy See."[2] When Lord Castlemain went to Rome the Jesuits made a great fuss over him, and entertained him at the Roman college. Among the inscriptions which adorned the place was:

Restituit Veterum tibi Religionis honorem Anglia Magnanimi Regis aperta fides.

Parsons' *Memorial for the Reformation of England* was

[1] James and his Queen were first anointed and crowned privately by Fr. Manhet (*Mansuetus, his confessor*) with the same holy oil of Rheims that the Kings of France used, Louis XIV. having sent some over at the King's request. Add. MS. 10,118, fol. 108.

[2] *A Complete History of England.* . . . All New Writ by a Learned and Impartial Hand. London, 1706, vol. iii. p. 460.

now produced and presented to the King as containing at least the lines upon which he might carry out his projects.[1] Only too well did he learn his lesson. There is little doubt in the writer's mind that to this book, interpreted by Petre and others, the King's downfall is to be attributed. To set forward now, when men's minds had changed, when the rights of individuals were being claimed, and when the people were arriving at a knowledge of their power, a scheme which was impossible a hundred years back, is a proof of the fascination Robert Parsons, even then, exercised over the mind of the English Jesuits. They could not realise that the essays of such a man at Reformation would not work. Throughout James' short reign a careful student can distinctly see traces of the influence of this book; and one can hardly doubt but that, had James succeeded, the whole of the provisions, including the Inquisition "under another name," would have been introduced. This is a conclusion based upon a careful comparison between James' actions and the principles set forth in Parsons' *Memorial*. It was evidently impossible, under the circumstances existing, to follow in detail all that Parsons had devised. The Reformation would be a matter of time and expediency. But the principles of that book and James' policy will be found to be identical.

The Jesuits opened churches in London and in the provinces, and were busy in the work of the ministry. It was now their Day, and they would suffer no opposition. Some Benedictines had opened a chapel in an upper room in the Savoy, and were attracting many. The Jesuits took the lower room for the same purposes, and by starting their services a little before forced the monks to move off elsewhere. The house in the Savoy was then turned into a public college and their community-house. In a short while more than four hundred boys of the best Catholic and Protestant families were being educated there. The prospectus announced that the education was gratis, and that all denominations would be admitted, and that the scholars would not be required to abandon or change their religion. Free schools were opened at Lincoln, Norwich,

[1] It was from the MS. of this work, found in King James' private library, that Dr. Gee, by order of William III., first published this remarkable work. We have already referred to Contzen's method for reducing people to the true faith.

York, and elsewhere. The fathers were most active, and were meeting with great success. But, as at the Savoy, so some of their means for obtaining it were not calculated to conciliate their Catholic brethren. Whether it was that Petre urged them on, or that their superiors were incautious, the proceedings of some of the Society gave great offence. In 1686 three of the Clergy opened a public church in Lime Street, which, after a month, they were compelled to relinquish, as the Jesuits brought a charge of Jansenism against them.[1] Within six months the church was reopened by the Society as one of theirs; and soon another college, endowed by the King, was begun there. This was done by means of Fr. Petre. At Bury St. Edmunds, the ruins of the old abbey had been offered for sale to the Benedictines; and they were on the point of purchasing it. But it was whispered in the King's ear that if the monks got back their old property, it would do him harm; for it would be said that he was going to restore the church property. At the King's expressed wish the Benedictines withdrew from the negotiations;—and the Jesuits opened a mission in their place.[2]

They basked in the royal favour. Their Provincial, Fr. Warner, was the King's confessor, and he played a part analogous to that which the French Jesuit Père La Chaise under-

[1] "Who is ignorant," says Gifford, one of the sufferers, "but that they have 10,000 mouths besides their own to open against any person whom interest or passion persuade them to persecute."

[2] Weldon, in his *Collections for a History of James II.*, thus recounts this episode: "When the King was on the Crown, as our house here in Paris bears the name of the Holy Martyr St. Edmund, King of the East Angles, those who had the lands of our old great Abbey of St. Edmunds in England, frivolously and vainly apprehensive that we should again re-enter into all, they proposed to ours the sale of 'em: but His Majesty, acquainted therewith, advised our fathers not to undertake the affair, that they might not give occasion to public clamours and noises that would be seditiously made under pretext that the monks were agoing to be put into possession of all again: whereupon our fathers, humbly submitting to His Majesty's sentiment, let fall the affair: but were sore astonished when afterwards they saw the Reverend Fathers of the Society of Jesus purchase them, which could not be taken but as a very great and cruel injury done the Order by the Society: how different a view they presented to His Majesty of it being properer and safer for them to make such purchases than us, is more than we are able to conceive or comprehend. Religious societies of all people whatever ought not to forget the great fundamental maxim of Christianity: Not to do to another what they would not have done to themselves." Add. MS. 10,118, fol. 697.

took with Louis XIV.—the power behind the throne. When the question of bishops came up again, and the Clergy had obtained from James a promise that no episcopal superior should be received unless he were an ordinary, the Jesuits prevailed upon him to admit an official with the title of Vicar Apostolic. Shortly after three more of these Vicars were appointed; and once admitted, this economy was continued till 1850, when at last the many efforts of the Clergy met with a partial success.

Petre was now all-powerful.[1] But unconsciously he was being deceived by Sunderland, whom he had recommended to the King as President of the Council.[2] Sunderland made use of the Jesuit to rush the King on to his ruin. A word as to this Father Petre, who takes such a prominent place in the history of the last of the Stuarts. He was "descended from an honourable family; his manners were courtly; his speech was flowing and plausible; but he was weak and vain, covetous and ambitious. Of all the evil counsellors who had access to the royal ear, he bore perhaps the largest share in the ruin of the House of Stuart."[3] He attained to such a position of power that the Jesuit began to hold a little court of his own, and was called openly by his flatterers "Your Eminence." James began to prepare the way for the advancement of his favourite. The archbishopric of York was

[1] But the bulk of the Catholics were afraid of the results of the King's wild policy upon the people. "While the nation was in a manner stunned with these outrageous proceedings, we are told there was a general meeting of the leading Roman Catholics at the Savoy, to consult how this favourable crisis might be most improved to the advantage of their cause. Father Petre had the chair; and at the very opening of the debates it appeared that the majority were more inclined to provide for their own security than to come to extremities with the Protestants. Notwithstanding the King's zeal, power, and success, they were afraid to push the experiment any farther. . . . Some were for a petition to the King that he would only so far interpose in their favour that their estates might be secured to them by Act of Parliament with exemption from all employments, and liberty to worship God in their own way, in their own homes. Others were for obtaining the King's leave to sell their estates, and transfer themselves and their effects to France. All, but Fr. Petre, were for a compromise of some sort or another. But he disdained whatever had a tendency to moderation, and was for making the most of the voyage while the sea was smooth and the wind prosperous" (Ralph's *History of England*, vol. i. p. 933).

[2] Barillon to Louis XIV., Fox's *History of James II.* p. cliv.

[3] Macaulay, *History of England*, vol. i. p. 357.

vacant, and the place was kept open for two years so that Petre might be appointed. But the Pope, Innocent XI., was no friend to the Society at large, and his Nuncio at the English Court, Ferdinand d'Adda, was in frequent communication with Rome on this subject. On 22nd October 1686 he received definite instructions to dissuade the King from urging the matter. But James would not listen to reason. A solemn embassy was sent to Rome to secure a bishopric for Petre, and the Pope was assailed also by the Grand Duke of Tuscany, who instructed his ambassador in London, Terriesi, to promote the business. Fortunately the correspondence of Terriesi, an eye-witness, is at hand to give us valuable information. From his despatches we can learn what public opinion in England thought about Petre[1] and James. Writing to the Grand Duke (22nd July 1686), he says: "Let your Highness prepare to hear continually fresh news of this country, both as to its temporal and spiritual affairs; for the King seems determined to push forward in matters of religion as far as he can. And the Jesuit Petre, who governs him, is the man to force him on to extremes without a thought as to the consequences."[2] He says plainly that Protestants believe "that the Jesuits are at present the *primo mobile* of the government." And that so bitter is the feeling that the English "would rather be ruled by Mahometans than by a Catholic government directed by Jesuits." Writing 30th December 1686, he says: "The Jesuit, Father Petre, rules His Majesty's mind more than ever, and, as a large share of the ecclesiastical policy, which the King conducts according to his direction, has been handed over to him, they say that Cardinal Howard at Rome will no longer have that part there in the management of the affairs of His

[1] Dryden in *The Hind and the Panther* (Part III.) thus speaks of Petre, in the Fable of the Swallows:

> "With these the Martin readily concurred,
> A church begot and church-believing bird;
> Of little body but of lofty mind,
> Round-bellied, for a dignity designed,
> And much a dunce, as Martins are by kind;
> Yet often quoted Canon-laws and Code,
> And Fathers which he never understood;
> But little learning needs in noble blood."

[2] Add. MSS. 25,372.

Majesty and the Clergy of England which it is otherwise believed that he would have had."

One more extract must be allowed as showing that common report had it that James was a tool in the hands of his Jesuit advisers. Writing 15th August 1687 Terriesi says: "The report they (*the people*) circulate, ascribing all the trouble to the Jesuits' counsel, by which they say His Majesty is completely governed, is most intolerable to the King. Yet I believe it in a great measure to be a calumny; still, as His Majesty has the Jesuits so constantly with him, it causes suspicions, which will be worse if Father Petre becomes Cardinal, as it is said the King certainly wishes, for the people cannot bear being governed by the Jesuits, who are the only object of their hatred, and whose vengeance they fear, as they know they deserve it."

When the embassy reached Rome it met with all sorts of diplomatical difficulties. The Pope would not discuss the question of Petre's episcopacy. He proposed to send Cardinal Howard to England, a proposal acceptable to many in England; "but those who are united with Father Petre and Father Warner, the confessor, have shelved the proposed journey of the Cardinal as useless and tending only to produce divisions between Catholics, who are already by no means too much united."[1] Moreover, the Jesuit party succeeded in removing the Cardinal altogether from the charge of English affairs in Rome, as he was an opponent of Petre's advancement.

James determined to see what his personal influence with Innocent XI. could do. There is a long correspondence between the King and Pope in the British Museum,[2] beginning 16th June 1687, on which day James writes:

"We must confess, however, that it is a great grief to us that the advancement of the reverend Father Edward Petre to the episcopal dignity should be attended with such great and unexpected difficulty. We the more readily interest ourselves in his favour (to omit his great abilities and known deserts) because we are thoroughly convinced of the zeal with which he hath applied himself to the Catholic interest

[1] Barillon (3rd November).

[2] Add. MSS. 9341.

and to our own, and because in a more exalted position he would be of greater service to posterity. This has been alleged in our mandates to our ambassador; and indeed we hope your Holiness from your paternal affection to us and our kingdoms, on mature consideration will favour this our most equitable request."

It was unfortunate for Petre that such a Pope as Innocent XI. then sat in the chair of St. Peter. He was, as we have said, no lover of the Jesuits, and as he was determined to put an end to the perpetual complaints he was receiving against the doings of the Society, had lately forbidden them to receive any more novices. His constant reply to James' letters was: "We cannot with a safe conscience comply with your request." At first the Pope based his denial upon the well-known vow which binds Jesuits to refuse any ecclesiastical dignity. Writing to the King, 24th November, the Pope says: "We now feel considerable annoyance in what regards the professed Jesuit whom you wish us to raise to the episcopal dignity, for although he may possess eminent virtues and special claims, nevertheless the constitutions of his Society do not permit us to comply with your Majesty's wishes, lest we should introduce a precedent extremely dangerous to the approved institutions of the Society, and tending to relax religious discipline."

As the King could not get a mitre for his favourite, he now put forward a petition for a hat. James defends him from the charge of ambition. But the Pope was obdurate. There was now a personal opposition to the individual. Reports had reached Rome of the Jesuit's indiscreet behaviour; and this was enough for the Pontiff. Petre remained a simple Jesuit all his days.

Innocent, through his confessor, Maracci, informed the General of the Jesuits that he was convinced that Petre was the author of the applications for his promotion. Upon this the General wrote to Fr. John Keynes, the English Provincial, saying that the Pope has this conviction, and is grieved to find himself reduced to the cruel alternative of either creating cardinal an ambitious Jesuit, or of refusing the King's request. The General then orders Petre to refuse this honour, and to

beg the King to refrain from insisting.[1] Considering the frequent exact and secret accounts which are forwarded to the General by his subjects, one or the other, it is worth while noting that the General seems to have entertained the possibility of Petre intriguing for himself in the matter of promotion. It is said, on the strength of a lost letter, sent in reply by the Provincial, that the Pope was quite satisfied as to the suspicion of personal ambition; but in his letter to James (14th February 1688) he contents himself with saying in general terms: ". . . we would have you persuaded that we have a full belief in what you testify."[2]

How did the Jesuits take this failure? Terriesi, who was friendly to them, writes (13th November 1688): "The Jesuits have heard with such displeasure of His Holiness' refusal, whatever its nature may be, that they have persuaded the King that now is the time to show His Holiness some resentment. They have proposed to His Majesty to recall his ministers from Rome, and to dismiss the Nuncio from England, as they attribute to him all the objections and hindrances that come from His Holiness. But it has been finally resolved and executed that the King is to write His Holiness a dry and short letter, in which he is to signify to him it is no longer the dignity of a bishop but the cardinalate he now requires; and he is to conclude by saying he could be a good Roman Catholic and yet separate himself from the Court of Rome. His Majesty then told the Nuncio the substance of what he had written to His Holiness, and added that this also should be written, that as long as he lived and reigned, no one should ever be made Cardinal at England's request until Father Petre was first made."

This attitude of the Jesuits is not altogether extraordinary. Their brethren in France were working on precisely the same

[1] Cretineau-Joly, ed. 4, vol. iv. p. 147.

[2] D'Adda was opposed to Petre's promotion; so was the Queen; but Terriesi (5th March 1688) tries to discount his objections by saying that D'Adda's difficulties were the suggestions of the French ambassador, for French interests and also of Lord Sunderland's. In the Earl of Denbigh's MSS. is a letter from Windsor, saying the Pope's Nuncio complains of the conduct of Father Petre, who dreams of nothing else but extreme measures (*Historical MSS. Commission*, Appendix vii. Report, p. 225).

lines, and had, at that date, accepted the Declaration of the rights of the Gallican Church. They went farther, according to Ranke: "The principals of the French Jesuits avoided all intercourse with the papal Nuncios lest they should bring upon themselves the suspicions of entertaining ultramontane opinions."[1]

If Petre was to have no ecclesiastical dignity, a political one was in the King's own power. On 11th November 1687 Petre was sworn in as Privy Councillor. On this occasion the Jesuit took an Oath of Allegiance which gave grave scandal, and in Rome his action was commented upon in unfavourable terms.[2] Terriesi tries to smooth over matters: "The complaint made at Rome against Fr. Petre about the oath taken by the Catholic Councillors of State is nothing more than a persecution of the clerical party . . . I don't see how this father can be much blamed in the matter, as of all the Catholic Councillors he was probably the last to take the Oath."

The English laity at large, especially the rich, were greatly opposed to all these doings. They, too, like their fellow-countrymen, had no wish to be ruled by Jesuits. The history of the past hundred years had sunk deeply into their minds. They saw how the influence of the English Jesuits, when exerted outside the spiritual sphere, had only resulted in disaster, persecution, and hatred. They represented the matter to Rome; and the Pope, over and over again, begged James to act moderately and cautiously. But to no good. For, according to Barillon, the Jesuit party were loud in asserting that now was the most propitious moment they could hope for, and, if it were allowed to pass, it would be long before such a chance could occur again. James was now entirely in their hands. He refers to the matter in some loose papers found in his closet: "Hence it came that the King, contrary to his own

[1] *Op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 391.

[2] Cardinal d'Estrées writing from Rome to Louis XIV. (11th May 1688), says: "Le Cardinal de Norfolk pour discrediter le père Peters dans l'esprit du pape; lui montra un serment qui prononcent les membres du conseil secret du roi d'Angleterre, serment de défendre tous les droits annexés à la Couronne d'Angleterre par les décrets du parlement. Le Cardinal de Norfolk soutenait que ces décrets etaient schismatiques et qu'ils faisaient du roi chef de l'Eglise Anglicane" (Michaud, *Louis XIV. et Innocent XI.* vol. ii. p. 118).

judgment and the Queen's advice, made Fr. Petre a Privy Councillor (though he was not sworn till some time after); for as soon as the Queen heard of what was designed, she earnestly begged of the King not to do it, that it would give great scandal not only to Protestants but to thinking Catholics, and even to the Society itself as being against their rules. Notwithstanding the King was so bewitched by my Lord Sunderland and Father Petre as to let himself be prevailed upon to do so indiscreet a thing. This, however, was not the only bait this cunning Lord had cast in Fr. Petre's way; he proposed that His Majesty should ask for a cardinal's cap for him, and that, to be sure, was the main drift of this pompous embassy to Rome. He knew that this father's character would draw the odium of all displeasing councils upon himself, and so be both an instrument and a cloak to all his dark designs."[1]

James, looking back from the calm of exile, saw the truth. He had, indeed, been bewitched. In a letter dated 2nd February 1687 we learn particulars of his extravagant regard for the Society, which will explain many things. It will be worth while to quote the whole of the letter. The writer says:

"It cannot be said what great affection and kindness the King hath for the Society, wishing much health to this whole college, by R. P., the Provincial, and earnestly recommending himself to our prayers. The Provincial, Alexander Regnes,[2] being come back from England, the King was graciously pleased to send for him (several earls and dukes waiting his coming at the hour appointed), the Queen being present, the King, discoursing familiarly with him, asked him how many young students he had, and how many scholastics? to which (when the Provincial had answered that of the latter he had twenty, of the former more than fifty) he added, That he had need of double or treble that number to perform what he, in his mind, had designed for the Society; and commanded that they should be very well exercised in the gift of preaching, for such only (saith he) do we want in England.

[1] Clarke, *Life of James II.* vol. iii. p. 77. The authenticity of the Memoirs included in this *Life* are contested by some on grounds which seem frivolous.

[2] Fr. John Keynes.

"You have heard, I make no doubt, that the King hath sent letters to Father La Chaise, the French King's confessor, about Watten House, therein declaring that he would take in good part from him whatsoever he did or was done for the English fathers of that Society. Father Clare, rector of the said house, going about those affairs at London, found an easy access to the King, and as easily obtained his desires. He was forbid to kneel and kiss the King's hand (as the manner or custom is) by the King himself saying, 'Once indeed your Reverence kissed my hand, but had I then known you were a priest I should rather have kneeled and kissed your Reverence's hand.'

"After the business was ended, in a familiar discourse the King declared to the father, that he would either convert England or die a martyr; and that he had rather die to-morrow, that conversion wrought, than reign fifty years without that in happiness and prosperity. Lastly, he called himself a son of the Society, the welfare of which, he said, he as much rejoiced at as his own; and it can scarce be said how joyful he showed himself when it was told to him that he was made partaker, by the most reverend Father N., of all the merits of the Society, of which number he would declare one of his confessors. Some report R. P., the Provincial, will be the person, but whom he designs is not known. Many do think an archbishopric will be bestowed on Father Edmund Petre (chiefly beloved), and very many a cardinal's cap; to whom (within this month or two) that whole part of the King's palace is granted in which the King, when he was Duke of York, used to reside; where you may see I know not how many courtiers daily attending to speak with his Eminency (for so they are said to call him), upon whose counsel and also that of several Catholic peers, highly preferred in the kingdom, the King greatly relies, which way he may promote the faith without violence. Not long since, some Catholic peers did object to the King that he made too much haste to establish the faith, to which he answered, 'I, growing old, must make great steps, otherwise if I should die I shall leave you worse than I found you.' Then they asking him, Why, therefore, was he not more solicitous for the conversion of his daughters, heirs

of this kingdom? he answered, 'God will take care of an heir: leave my daughters for me to convert; do you, by your example, reduce those that are under you, and others, to the faith.'

"In most provinces he hath preferred Catholics, and in a short time we shall have the same Justices of the Peace (as they are called) in them all. At Oxford we hope matters go very well: one of our divines is always resident there, a public Catholic chapel of the vice-chancellor's, who hath drawn some students to the faith. The Bishop of Oxford (*Parker*) seems very much to favour the Catholic cause; he proposed in council, Whether it was not expedient that at least one college in Oxford should be allowed Catholics, that they might not be forced to be at so much charges by going beyond the seas to study? What answer was given is not yet known. The same bishop inviting two of our noblemen, with other of the nobility, to a banquet, drank the King's health to an heretical baron there, wishing a happy success to all his affairs; and he added, that the faith of Protestants in England seemed to him to be little better than that of Buda was before it was taken; and that they were, for the most part, mere atheists who defended it. Many do embrace the faith, and four of the chiefest earls have lately professed it publicly.

"The reverend father, Alexander Regnes, nephew to our Provincial, to whom is committed the care of the chapel of the ambassador of the most serene Elector-Palatine, is whole days busied in resolving and showing the doubts or questions of heretics concerning their faith, of which number you may see two or three continually walking before the doors of the chapel, disputing about matters of faith among themselves. [As to] Prince George, we can have nothing certain what faith he intends to make profession of.

"We have a good while begun to get a footing in England. We teach humanity at Lincoln, Norwich, and York. At Warwick we have a public chapel secured from all injuries by the King's soldiers. We have also bought some houses of the city of Wigan in the province of Lancaster. The Catholic cause very much increaseth. In some Catholic churches, upon holidays, above fifteen hundred are always

numbered, present at the sermon. At London, likewise, things succeed no worse: every holiday or preaching people so frequent, that many of the chapels cannot contain them. Two of our fathers, Darmes and Berfall,[1] do constantly say Mass before the King and Queen; Father Edmund Neville before the queen-dowager; Father Alexander Regnes in the chapel of the Ambassador aforesaid; others in other places. Many houses are bought for the college in the Savoy (as they call it) nigh Somerset House, London, the palace of the queen-dowager, to the value of about eighteen thousand florins, in making of which after the form of a college they labour very hard, that the school may be opened before Easter.

"In Ireland shortly there will be a Catholic Parliament, seeing no other can satisfy the King's will to establish the Catholic cause there. In the month of February, for certain, the King hath designed to call a Parliament at London—(1) That by a universal decree the Catholic peers may be admitted into the Upper House; (2) that the Oath or Test may be annulled; (3) which is the best or top of all, that all penal laws made against Catholics may be abrogated; which, that he may more surely obtain, he desires everyone to take notice that he hath certainly determined to dismiss any from all profitable employment under him, who do not strenuously endeavour the obtaining those things; also, that he will dissolve the Parliament, with which decree, some heretics being affrighted, came to a certain peer to consult him what was best to be done; to whom he said, the King's pleasure is sufficiently made known to us; what he hath once said he will most certainly do: if you love yourselves you must submit yourselves to the King's will. There are great preparations for war at London, and a squadron of many ships of war is to be fitted against a time appointed; what they are designed for is not certain. The Hollanders greatly fear they are against them, and therefore begin to prepare themselves. Time will discover more." *Liège, 2nd February* 1688.[2]

[1] Frs. Dormer and Bertue. *Foley.*

[2] Somers Tracts (ed. Scott), vol. ix. pp. 76–78.

Some of the details of the plan can be found in the correspondence between Petre and La Chaise, published in the Somers Tracts. These letters are generally considered to be spurious, or at least largely interpolated; but there are passages which are certainly founded on fact. Petre tells his correspondent: "The King changes as many heretic officers as he can, to put Catholics in their places; but the misfortune is that here we want Catholic officers to supply them; and therefore, if you know any such of our nation in France you would do the King a pleasure to persuade them to come over . . . Our fathers are continually employed to convert the officers, but their obstinacy is so great that for one that turns there are five that rather quit their commands. And there being so many malcontents, whose party is already too great, the King has need of all his prudence and temper to manage this great affair and bring it to the perfection we hope to see it in ere long . . . As for Ireland, that country is already all Catholic, yea all the militia are so. The viceroy (*Tyrconnel*) merits great praise; we may give him this honour, that he is a son worthy our Society, and I hope will participate in the merits of it. He informs me he has just writ to your Reverence of these matters how things go there. His Majesty does us the honour to visit our college often, and is most pleased when we present him some new convert scholars, whom he encourages with his gracious promises. I have no expressions sufficient to let you know with what devotion His Majesty communicated last holidays, and a heretic cannot better make his court to him than by turning to the Catholic faith. He desires that all the religious of what order soever they be, make open profession, as he does, not only of the Catholic faith, but also of their order; not at all approving that priests or religious should conceal themselves out of fear; and he has told them that he would have them wear the habit of a religious, and that he would take care to defend them from offence.

"His Majesty is so desirous that all things may be done in order and upon a sure found, so as to be the more lasting, that he makes great application to the shires and corporations to get such person chosen for the Parliament as may be favourable to his ends, of which he may be sure before

they come to debate. And the King will make them promise so firmly and exact such instruments from them in writing, that they shall not be able to go back unless they will draw upon themselves His Majesty's utmost displeasure, and make them feel the weight of his resentment . . .

"Nor have we any hope that His British Majesty will interpose him openly, he receiving so little satisfaction from His Holiness in some demands made by his ambassador at Rome, which (morally speaking) ought not to have been denied to so great a King, who first made this step (which his predecessors for a long time were not willing to undertake) in sending his ambassador of obedience to Rome. And yet, for all this our holy father had not any particular consideration of this submission and filial obedience."

In La Chaise's reply (7th March 1688) he calls Petre's attention to Parsons' *Memorial*, in case he did not know it, and says that the opposition shown by Creighton to Parsons' schemes was allowed by the General, Aquaviva, so that the Society should be on the winning side whether James or Philip won.

Another object of attack on the part of the Jesuits was the universities. The Provincial tried to get a footing in Oxford. With the leave of the General three of his subjects took their doctorate at Treves. But at the very beginning of these attacks on the universities, the King's confessor, who was then a Franciscan, was approached by the moderate Catholic party, and besought to oppose the mischievous counsels of Petre. The Jesuits, under the circumstances, did not consider it well that anyone, not under obedience to them, should have such freedom of access to the King as the Franciscan enjoyed. His dismissal was brought about; and Fr. Warner, an ex-Provincial, was, on Petre's recommendation, appointed to the post. The field was now clear for their operations. There is a remarkable circumstance connected with this attempt to carry the universities. The two men chosen by the King to be forced on the universities, despite all protest and right, were not, as may be expected, members of the Society. They were Bonaventure Gifford, one of the Clergy, and Alban Francis, a Benedictine. Petre did not put forward any of his own Society

at the moment, though one of them, Fairfax, was subsequently appointed professor of philosophy in Magdalen College, Oxford. Neither Gifford nor Francis were men of any particular mark or standing, and it is difficult to assign the reason for their selection, with the exception that they, and not Jesuits, would have to bear the odium of such doings.

About the beginning of 1690 there was also a proposal to bestow Trinity College, Dublin, on the Jesuits; and six of the fathers went over to take possession of the buildings. But this came too late.

As regards the Established Church, the policy of the Jesuits cannot be doubted. The Ecclesiastical Commission was the engine destined to bring about its destruction. The Bishop of London was suspended in 1686, the Archbishop of Canterbury was removed from the Commission, Thomas Cartwright was made Bishop of Chester, and Samuel Parker appointed to Oxford, with the intention of bringing about a disruption. In 1687 James suspended the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance and the other tests imposed by law, and made his Declaration of Liberty of Conscience. This he ordered the bishops to order their Clergy to publish from the pulpit. Seven of the bishops, to their honour, refused, basing their action on the ground that the Declaration was founded upon a Dispensing Power such as often had been declared illegal by Parliament.

When James made his great blunder of ordering the arrest of the seven bishops, there can be but little doubt that here the hand of Petre was to be found. True, his name does not appear on the document; but we learn that it was purposely omitted lest he should incur the odium of the proceeding. There must have been a certain sense of grim humour in the Jesuit teaching the Anglican bishops to live up to the doctrine of obedience. Burnet says: "Father Petre seemed now as one transported with joy; for he thought the King was engaged to break with the Church of England. And it was reported that he broke out into that indecent expression upon it that they should be made to eat their own dung."[1] If this unseemly expression be truly reported, it reminds one of what

[1] *History of his own Times* (ed. Oxon.), p. 259.

Parsons, just one hundred years before, had written as being said by John Aylmer, Bishop of London, about some Catholic prisoners.[1] The *Tu quoque* had lost nothing by keeping.

Such a King with such advisers could only meet with one fate from an indignant people. Now was the time when Petre gave the only sensible advice that is recorded of him. He advised the King not to fly the country. In after days James used to say that "had he but listened to Fr. Petre's counsels his affairs would have been in a very different position." These words the pious writer of the *Annual Letters* takes as referring to Petre's general sagacity, and concludes by saying: "After so honourable a testimony, I do not see what place is left for either calumny or envy."

In the general confusion Petre escaped to the Continent, and, as far as we know, never again met the King he had misled.[2] He remained at St. Omer, of which school he became Rector, and did much to increase its property.

It is the custom to speak sternly of Petre's foolhardy conduct, and to accuse him of ambition. I think historians have not, as a rule, understood the full position of the case. Petre has been made the scapegoat for others. I do not wish to extenuate his responsibility for the catastrophe; but I do think the chief blame rests upon other shoulders. If he were free from ambition, who, then, were the ambitious men? Petre, like a good Jesuit, was in the hands of his superiors, *perinde ac cadaver*. It was, therefore, the Superiors of the Society who were the ambitious men. They, and they alone, are primarily guilty of the fall of the Stuarts. Hitherto they have escaped, while Petre has borne the opprobrium. The General, the Provincial, and the Confessor are the real culprits. If, as we know,

[1] *Records of the English Catholics*, vol. ii. p. 238, note.

[2] Among the Stuart Papers which the Cardinal of York sent to Windsor is an important document which James II. made at Whitehall just before the defection of his principal officers. In this he entrusts the Prince of Wales to the guardianship of the Queen, and appoints a Council to advise her. Among the forty-one names, that of Father Edmund Petre does not appear. The document is dated 17th November 1688, being witnessed by Pepys and seven others. This would lead one to imagine that James had already begun to lose confidence in Petre; the more so when we find he is not included to counteract the influence of the Bishop of Durham, who was one of the new Council. See *The Stuart Dynasty*, by Percy M. Thornton, pp. 281, 282.

EDWARD PETRE, S.J.

1631—1699

From an engraving by Roman de Hooghe

from a letter dated 13th March 1688,[1] the Provincial had, without the leave of the General, allowed Petre to accept the office of Privy Councillor, still, the General tolerated it. Considering that they knew all about the man, and yet left him in this position; considering that they allowed him to take the oath and become a Privy Councillor, who can now say that they were not the ambitious men? The *libido dominandi* eats into a Society as well as into persons, and more easily where the individual gives up all personal ambition, and makes his Society his all in all.

Petre was entirely subject to his superiors, both in intellect and will. They knew his inmost thoughts; and he was as wax in the hands of a moulder, or as a stick in the hands of a blind man. With him as a figurehead, decked either with the archiepiscopal mitre of York or the red hat of Rome, they, as the power behind the throne, could direct and pull the strings which would make the puppet dance to their piping. Why should not the position of King's confessor, which ex-Provincial Warner held in England, be as powerful as that enjoyed by his fellow-Jesuit at that moment in France? We hold, then, that Petre is rather to be pitied than blamed. It is said he went down on his knees and begged James to allow him to retire from Court. Truly the King was "bewitched." Fr. Petre was the victim of a system; and his ruin and that of his King was brought about by those who demanded blind obedience.

We must also point out a strange fact. The fall of two Stuart Kings was brought about by books of Robert Parsons. On one hand, the Protestant party made use of the *Book of the Succession* to drive Charles I. and James away from the throne; and, on the other, the Jesuits, by forcing the latter King to rule in the spirit of the *Memorial for the Reformation of England*, succeeded in bringing about the Revolution. The Jesuits had had their grand opportunity of showing their skill at statecraft. It resulted only in establishing the Protestant Succession and destroying their friends.

[1] Cretineau-Joly, vol. iv. p. 148.

CHAPTER XVI

FAILURE

THE Jesuit work was practically destroyed. The Grea Revolution marks the lowest depths to which the Catholi Church in England fell after so many reverses. Hope seeme to be gone. The Anglican Church and the Protestan Succession were established upon the ruins of Catholic aspira tions; and the penal laws, if not so bloodily enforced, becam heavier and more sure in action. Thousands of the laity disgusted at being misled by men who, on account of thei spiritual office, claimed to lead, forsook such chieftains and fel away. Those who remained steadfast sank down and becam a mere sect, despised on account of their numbers and weakness The Catholics were now the outcasts of the nation. Such i England, as in Poland, were the results of Jesuit politics.

The annals of the English Jesuits now are mainly o domestic interest. Removed from the world of politics they could devote themselves to their proper work. Bu the old spirit of restlessness remained. Too wise not t accept accomplished facts, they took little or no part in th Jacobite outbreaks of 1715 and 1745. In those days Catholics, as a rule, not unnaturally clung to the Stuarts, and were among the foremost of the supporters of the Pretender There was much sentiment in the idea; and it is a question whether the Stuarts were worthy of the devotion lavished upon them. But the Jesuit has taught himself to suppress all such follies in his own heart. The Stuarts were gone past hope all that was then left to the Society was to make the best o what was to be found in England. The Jesuits now devoted their energies to keep the faith alive, here and there, in many "an old-fashioned house of gloomy appearance, closed in with

high walls, with an iron gate and yews, and the report attaching to it that 'Roman Catholics' lived there."[1] They sat down to wait again for another "Golden Day," when Englishmen by education would know how to use the rights they were then engaged in winning. The controversy with the Jansenists, which had been going on in France for many years, opened a way for their activities. Jansenism seems to have been, in the beginning, like Luther's, a legitimate protest against a prevalent laxity. The sight of the French King, year after year, leaving his mistresses for a few days while he made his Easter Communion, and then returning at once to the unlawful connections, was only an outward sign of the inward corruption. The principles of Casuistry were sometimes stretched until Conscience was nowhere and Direction took its place.[2] The extravagances of some moralists were responsible for the scandals that ensued. It was to protest against this lowering of sacred things, this casting of pearls before swine, that certain men took a more rigid and earnest view of religion; and to this they joined theories on the abstruse subject of grace, which were opposed to the opinions of certain Jesuit theologians. Blaise Pascal in 1656 began his famous *Provincial Letters* which, while making French literature, held up the Jesuits to the ridicule of the world. Though quite unscrupulous in his methods of attack or in the arguments he used, Pascal received much help from the senseless behaviour of the Jesuits themselves, that to this as well as to him the downfall of the Society in France is largely to be attributed. Instead of yielding in what was true in the letters (and a great deal is true), the apologists defended their writers through thick and thin. They would not allow that one of "ours" could have made a mistake, although Popes had not been slow to condemn them. It is through this exaggerated *esprit de corps* that stirs up the whole body in defence of one member (*Qui unum tangit, tangit omnes*), that they eventually came to grief. Thus attacked both on the moral and dogmatic

[1] Newman, *Sermons preached on Various Occasions*, ed. 1892, p. 172.

[2] Mutius Vitelleschi wrote to the Society, 4th January 1617: "Some opinions of ours, especially in matters pertaining to morals, are far too free, and not only is there danger that they may upset the Society but be also of great detriment to the universal Church of God."—*Epist. Præp. Gen.* (Antwerp, 1635), p. 432.

side, the evil passions of either parties were inflamed; and good men and true were, by the bitterness of their opponents, driven at last into an attitude of defiance which lead to an open rupture.

Odium theologicum gained the victory, and in the intoxication of triumph the Jesuits did not hesitate to use the convenient charge of Jansenism against any who ventured to oppose them. To such an extent was this carried that Innocent XII. in 1694 was obliged to interfere. But the mischief went on. "Some persons moderated themselves in it, and when they durst not speak plain, their custom was to mutter something of men's being *tainted*, or, with a malicious air of compassion, wish it were not so, or, in fine, with a *shrug* or a *But* in their character show how great a reluctance they had to be divorced from the darling vice of calumny. This obstinate behaviour of some persons in regard of Jansenists of their own making occasioned the same Pope, Innocent XII., to issue out a second decree in the year 1696, wherein he severely rebukes such as make use of the flying calumny of Jansenism to drive on their private ends."[1]

The English Jesuits were not behindhand in the matter. Dodd tells the Provincial in the year 1703 they "industriously dispersed a book through the whole kingdom called *The Secret Polity of the Jansenists*, which *they* pretended was written by a converted doctor of Sorbonne, but indeed was penned in the year 1651 by a skulking French Jesuit, Etiènnne de Champ and translated by *them*,[2] with a preface and some additions relating to the Jansenists in Holland, and fitted for your present design. Now the marks of Jansenism delivered in this book are much different from those given by His Holiness. The substance whereof (. . .) I find to be, namely, Jansenists are a people who rail much at loose morals and frequently accuse the Jesuits as abettors of such doctrines. They preach up the discipline and purity of the primitive age . . . the Sorbonnists are all enemies to the Pope and direct Jansenists."[3]

The object of this was soon found out. The Clergy

[1] Dodd's *Secret Policy of the English Jesuits*, pp. 257, 258. The French bishops in 1700 decided that they would not tolerate those importune and malevolent men, who bring a vague and envious accusation of Jansenism against men who are good and devoted to learning and ecclesiastical business, etc.

[2] Fr. Thomas Fairfax in 1702 was the translator.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 263.

England, to whom the Jesuits had always been hostile, were, as a body, accused of Jansenism. "Some were attacked by name, with time, place, and other circumstantial matters. This affair was carried on by letters as well as by word of mouth. Providence would have it so that several of the Jesuits' letters should fall into proper hands, which plainly discover how busy the Society was in bringing in the Clergy to be guilty of Jansenism, what methods and men they made use of, what encouragements and rewards, etc."[1] They sent charges to Rome to this effect, and the accusations were sent back to Bishop Stonor, the vicar-apostolic of the Midland district (1716–1756). They were to this effect—that pictures of prominent Jansenists were exposed in chapels belonging to the Clergy, that their converts were taught to speak disrespectfully of the Pope, with other accusations respecting indulgences, and a distinct accusation of Mr. S[ergeant?] concerning the Provincial Letters. Fr. Sabran, the Provincial, in a letter to Cardinal Caprara, dated 5th November 1710, accuses the Clergy of having published several treatises against the Jesuits (which is an unpardonable Jansenism) . . . and in particular Dr. S[tonor?] is mentioned as a Jansenist without restriction. He complains that the vicars-apostolic did nothing against the heresy, besides printing a small book against it.[2]

The Clergy began to be moved. Spies were discovered, and "indiscrete blabs, who could not keep silence," were removed or banished. The first step was to force the Provincial to disclaim officially these hints. He stated before witnesses, "That he had met with no such persons as Jansenists in the south, and further added that he was newly returned from his visit in the northern parts, and that neither had he heard nor did know any person in that district who could be accused of the said opinions of Jansenism." Having obtained this official denial, which, after all, only goes as far as the Provincial's own personal experience, the Clergy wrote to Rome to deny the imputations made upon them by clandestine enemies. The Pope replied, 17th February 1711, that he had with pleasure received their declaration, which closed "the mouths of them that spake iniquity."

[1] *Ibid.* p. 265.

[2] Cf. *Ibid.* pp. 267, 268.

What was the cause of this wanton attack on the Clergy It may perhaps be found at the college of Douai. Marlborough was besieging the town and Fr. Sabran the college.

Dodd thus accounts for it: "The Bishop of Arras (in whose diocese Douai stands) had in several things been insulted by the Jesuits of Douai and their party. The English Clergy struck in with some warmth for their diocesan who, having had a long experience of their zeal and learning he afterwards looked upon them with greater marks of respect than usual, and employed them in some things relating to the government of his diocese, in which the Walloon Jesuits and their friends had sometimes had a stroke. This preference is esteemed to be the origin of all those persecutions the college soon after underwent. . . . The gentleman, who is known by the name of the *turbulent fellow*,[1] [*w*]as a spy to lead them into the secrets and pretended abominations of the Clergy, [*so*] it would be requisite to show . . . what part he had in this tragedy, and how far the Jesuits made use of him. I am not ignorant that he disowns . . . being accessory and busy in this affair, and that the English Jesuits positively deny they held any correspondence with him or encouraged him to accuse the college of Jansenism. What I here advance is word for word the account given by his confederate, whom he had engaged in the same cause against Douai college, but afterwards struck with the heinousness of the fact deserted him, and before an apostolic notary and two qualified witnesses subscribed to the following Relation, which he drew up himself."[2]

This is a *résumé* of the document: The "Turbulent Gentleman" wanting to be ordained in some other place exposed his case to A. W., who introduced him to an English Jesuit, Fr. P[igott], then studying at Douai. Long and frequent conversations passed between them, and the Jesuit gave him to understand that it was no hard matter to procure orders, "for if he was in a mind to break off with his own superiors, the Jesuits would stand his friend." Thus allured

[1] This was Austin Newdigate Poyntz. He eventually became confessor in 17 to the English convent at Bruges.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 272, 273.

he fell in with their proposition. He found it would be agreeable to them "to ridicule the college, and expose them as rigorists and by degrees Jansenists. This when Fr. P[igott] perceived, he thought he had found a right person for his purpose," and to secure him told the "Turbulent Gentleman" "he could give him security for his orders in a very few days." The "Turbulent Gentleman" received from Fr. S[abran ?],[1] a Jesuit of note, a letter, "in which he first promised him care and protection; secondly, he assured him of his orders; thirdly, he advised him to persist in that opposition to his superiors, and to get as many as he could to his party, withal telling him how it was very commendable in him to resist the tyrannical proceedings, as he called them, of Mr. President; and the stronger the party was the easier a cure for the tyranny and rigorism could be effected." The "Turbulent Gentleman," thus supported, brought over to his side the writer of the Relation, who was already in the same quandary about his orders, and persuaded him to lay his case also before the Jesuit P[igot]. He did; and "it was agreed that when we would we might go to Rome, and that he (the Jesuit) had by letter from Fr. S[abran] all the security that could be imagined for our admission." But it was a case of nothing for nothing. The two students were told that they "must do them a kindness which they much desired." After much talk about Jansenism, "at last we were put to the question what arguments we could bring to show Dr. H[awarden] or any other of the superiors to be Jansenist?" The "Turbulent Gentleman" volunteered to prove him so from his lectures. But that was not enough; had he ever heard any of the professors talk at the college Jansenistically? After much searching, "at last he remembered that one Mr. M. had once said, were he to answer from the dictates of Dr. H[awarden] he should scarce make any other than the forty doctors had done, namely, concerning a *respectful silence*." This reply was found, after mature deliberation, to be a very material admission.

There was another student taken into confidence. Meanwhile Fr. S[abran] wrote again to the "Turbulent Gentleman," testifying "the satisfaction that the reverend father received in

[1] Fr. Sabran was the rector of the episcopal seminary at Liège.

his compliance with so holy an end. He was glad that the whole house was not tainted with the heresy, for so now he called it; and as for those persons who should engage with him, he bid them not fear (*for*) their orders; one word from him could made them be ordained."

After continual solicitations from the Jesuits, a draft embodying the accusations was given to the students to correct and before witnesses the Jesuit published his accusation against the authorities of the secular college.[1] It was with the greatest difficulty that the college was able to purge itself of the charge. Was this another attempt to get the establishment under the control of the Society? or is it to be looked upon as an episode in that feverish period when the charge of Jansenism was recklessly hurled about by the Jesuits against any or every one who did not agree with them? A taste for Jansenist-hunting had got into their system, and they had developed as keen a scent for that sport as the Spanish inquisitors did for heresy. Only a few years later they brought the same charge against the whole of the English Benedictine congregation.

The reply of the English Jesuits to this affair is given by Dodd. They had no house at Douai; Fr. S[abran] had made it his business, and could not find that any English Jesuit had had a hand in the accusation of Douai college; the "Turbulent Gentleman" was not dismissed from the college he was not made use of to bring in the accusation of Jansenism; Fr. S[abran] for his own part had not the *first thought* of any design: but in case they did accuse it, why must they be represented to have done it maliciously, and not through zeal and good design?

These are somewhat contradictory. One fact which Dodd mentions is significant. When the news came to Douai that

[1] Dodd in his *History of the English College at Douai* thus accounts for it "The account I had of it was this. Some masters of the English college had for several years desperately galled the Jesuits and some friends of theirs in publi disputations, and ridiculed their tenets with a great deal of smartness and eloquence This was very provoking, and hugely resented by the other party. And such kin of affronts are not easily forgotten when men's parts and opinions are laid open to th world with such disobliging circumstances. Hence I take it they studied to retaliat when a fit occasion offered itself, which proved to be not long after" (p. 33).

the English college was accused of Jansenism, five hundred and nine of the members of the university signed a protest, dated 2nd February 1708, bearing witness to the good repute of the college. But the rector of the Jesuits did not sign this protest.

Dodd, who was a contemporary and had access to documents which are beyond the present writer, is careful to say that he does not impute this action to all the English Jesuits, but only to "some busy impudent members, who either sat at the helm or were set on and directed by them."[1] The followers of Campion went about their work quietly, and lived at peace; it was those who trod in Parsons' footsteps that were ever restless and pushing. It was these last who always brought discredit upon the whole Society. In the words of one of their Generals, they caused the whole body "to be accused of being haughty, of desiring that all business should pass through our hands, of having too good an opinion of our wisdom, and too much contempt for that of others."[2]

Charles Dodd (1672–1743), the historian, whose name has been so often mentioned in these pages, wrote about this time *The History of the English College at Douai* (1713). This was promptly answered or, at least, replied to, by Father Thomas Hunter in *A Modest Defence of the Clergy and Religious* (1714), which has been described as "a clouded lampoon upon the Clergy." It was generally set forth as being the work of one of the professors at Douai, a Mr. Keirn; but the Jesuit authorship is incontestable. Dodd promptly replied by his stinging book, *The Secret Policy of the English Society of Jesus* (1715), a series of twenty-four letters addressed to their Provincial. Hunter returned to the charge, but his work remained in manuscript. In 1737 Dodd brought out the first volume of his great work, *The Church History of England from the Year* 1500 *to the Year* 1688; and the other two volumes followed in 1739 and 1742. Although bearing the imprint of Brussels, the work was really printed in England. It is a work which reflects the highest credit upon the Clergy, of whose body Dodd was a member. Unfortunately the remembrance of his past controversies with the Jesuits have left their traces; and Fr. John

[1] P. 285.

[2] Vitelleschi, *Epist. de Oratione*, p. 410.

Constable attacked him sharply in *A Specimen of Amendment candidly proposed to the Compiler of a Work which he calls The Church History of England* (1741), to which Dodd promptly replied by *An Apology for the Church History of England* (1742). There have been several attempts to continue Dodd's *History*, but hitherto the opposition raised against such a work has been too great to allow it to be successful. Canon Tierney of the Southwark Chapter brought out an edition, which was to extend to eight volumes, but his work (enriched as it was with most valuable notes and appendices from original sources) was suddenly stopped after the fifth volume.

In England, having got over somewhat the Jansenistical fever, the relations of the Society to the vicars-apostolic began to be strained;[1] and the Jesuits were accused of putting forward the Benedictines to attack the authority of the bishops. The Holy See was obliged to interfere and regulate the relations of the religious orders with the vicars-apostolic. Reports adverse to the Jesuits being spread about, the General wrote to the bishops to assure them of the loyalty and submission of his brethren to the decrees of the Holy See. Six of the bishops gave gracious replies to Fr. Carteret, the Provincial. That of Bishop Challoner may be quoted. It is a carefully worded letter. "In compliance with this your desire, and to bear witness to the truth, I do hereby certify by these presents, first, that none of your people were ever accused to us and by us, directly or indirectly, *either as if superiors tolerated the greatest excesses in their subjects, refusing to correct them, being admonished thereof by their respective V.V. A.A., or as if they were neglectful of the duties incumbent in each station, etc.* So far from it that, generally speaking, for the time I have had anything to do with this mission, I have found those of the Society, both superiors and inferiors,

[1] "Great opposition was made by the Benedictine monks in favour of their ancient independency; and their agent in Rome was indefatigable in making an interest for his brethren; and, if anything ruined his cause, besides the justice of the contrary party, it was this agent's boldness in pretending to direct and not to be directed by the subtle Italians. The Jesuits said little; they were cautious, and fought in the rear. For in case the Benedictines were baffled, they could have nothing to do but retire in order and compound" (Dodd's *History of the English College at Douai*, p. 32).

as regular in their conduct, and as diligent in their respective stations as those of any other denomination whatsoever. Secondly, as to their behaviour in our regards, I have never found any of them, either in town or country, wanting in their respect, but rather upon all occasions remarkably civil and ready to do any good office in their power" (31st December 1753).

Bishop Stonor, who had had special difficulty from some Jesuits, excused himself from giving any *special* testimony, and contents himself with "a more general assurance of my true respect and esteem for your Society, both in its primitive and modern state, both at home and abroad, and my desire to do it all service in my power, and be at perfect good understanding with it."[1]

The last few years of their existence in England seem to have been the most peaceful of all their history. It was the peace of stagnation. But the ruin which was being prepared for the whole Society was not far off. It is hardly necessary here to go into the general history of the suppression. The fact and the causes which led up to it are well known. They were inevitable. The spirit of restlessness which characterised the English Jesuits found its counterpart in other countries. The Jesuits had had the education of Catholic Europe practically in their own hands in the seventeenth century; and it was precisely from the descendants of their pupils that there arose a revolt against a yoke which had become unbearable. What brought about the suppression of the Society brought also the Revolution. They are links in the same chain.

Although one may say the suppression was, perhaps, deserved, yet no one acquainted with the history can refrain from pitying the unmerited suffering of thousands of helpless and harmless individuals who were punished for the misdeeds of superiors who invested themselves with the divine right they had refused to kings.

From all Catholic countries complaints went up to Rome against the Society. Many Popes had tried to restrain them; but the measures taken by one were nullified by a successor. The General, Lorenzo Ricci, would not hear of any compromise. He met all suggestions, it is said, with the words: "Let them be

[1] Foley, vol. v. pp. 164–7.

as they are or let them cease to be." It required the calm determination of so firm a Pontiff as Clement XIV. to do the deed. He saw that the time had come when the Society no longer served the Church. Hence he was bound to consider the interest of the whole body of the faithful before that of a mere Society. In the past, other religious orders had been suppressed when they had become a hindrance. The Jesuits were in no way necessary to the divine mission of the Church, under whose name they had sought their own ends. So after a long inquiry, over which he would not be hurried by the clamours of the Bourbon Courts, after scrupulously weighing the whole case, he issued, on 21st July 1773, his famous Breve, *Dominus ac Redemptor noster*, and suppressed the Jesuits. In this Breve, after mentioning the grave and weighty reasons which moved him,—their meddling in politics, their quarrels with bishops and other religious, their conformity with heathen usages in the East, and the disturbances they had stirred up even in Catholic countries, which caused persecution to the Church,—he adds there were others personally known to himself. "There," said he, putting down his pen, "There, then, is the Act of Suppression. I do not repent of what I have done; I did not resolve upon the measure until I had well weighed it. I would do it again. But this will be my deathblow."[1] This is thoroughly in keeping with the man as we know him. The sense of stern duty alone impelled him to act.

As soon as the Bull was signed it was immediately put into execution; and first of all in the Pope's own dominions. Ricci, the General, was imprisoned at once in the English college at Rome, thus repairing by his misfortune the injury done by Parsons to Bishop and Charnock. Although disbanded in all Catholic countries, the Jesuits found shelter from the Pope in Russia, under the schismatical Catherine II., and in Prussia under the infidel Frederick II.

The effect of the suppression upon the English Jesuits had perhaps been somewhat anticipated as regards their own establishments. They, of course, lost, in 1773, the seminaries belonging to the Clergy which they had for so long directed. But their own famous school at St. Omer had been already

[1] Guignard, *History of the Fall of the Jesuits*, p. 88.

THE COLLEGE AT ST. OMER AFTER 1685

From an old print

vacated when the French Government, in 1762, expelled the Jesuits from France. The fathers moved off to Bruges, where they arrived with their pupils on 11th August 1762. Here two colleges were opened, and flourished till the fatal year of 1773, when, by order of the Belgic-Austrian Council of Brussels, they were suddenly and violently expelled on 14th October by military force. Most of the pupils went to Liège. The English house in that town was left in the hands of the ex-Jesuits by the prince-bishop. Here they lived as Jesuits in everything else but name. They converted their house into an English seminary, which in 1778 was recognised by Rome as a pontifical seminary. The Revolution drove them away, and this time they set their faces towards England. Leaving Liège 14th July 1794, the first party arrived on 29th August at Stonyhurst in Lancashire, an estate put into their hands by the munificence of an old pupil, Mr. Weld. Stonyhurst [1] had been for a long time a Jesuit mission, and it is said that a former owner, Sir Richard Shireburne, a great favourite of Queen Elizabeth, was allowed by her to keep a priest in his house. Here the ex-Jesuits established themselves and reopened their school.

The college in Rome was taken away (1773) and restored to the Clergy. The seminaries in Spain fell; that of Valladolid passing into the hands of the Clergy; the novitiate at Watten was lost. Everything was gone. Stonyhurst alone remained, and that could not exist as a Jesuit college: it was kept by "gentlemen from Liège."

As a body, the English Jesuits accepted their suppression quietly. Some of their continental brethren, smarting under the treatment, published a gross libel on Clement XIV., accusing him of obtaining the popedom through simony. Fr. John Thorpe, an English Jesuit, was in Rome at this time; having been minister at the English college, he fell under the influence of this party. He wrote *A Candid and Impartial Sketch of the Life and Government of Pope Clement XIV.* (1785) in the form of letters to Fr. Charles Plowden, who was then tutor to the Welds of Lulworth. This ex-Jesuit prepared them for the press and sent them to two confrères in London, who

[1] The great Puritan Cromwell slept here one night.

published them. The work was considered so scandalous that Mr. Weld insisted upon its suppression. Thorpe was severely punished in Rome for this offence.

The numbers of the English Jesuits at the moment of the suppression is given by Foley at two hundred and seventy-four; one hundred and forty-three of whom were in England.

It is not our purpose to follow the subsequent history of the English Jesuits. Suffice it to say, that when the Society was restored in 1814 by Pius VII.,[1] the house at Stonyhurst was not canonically recognised, and the Jesuits were not restored in England till 1830. Since then their spread has been rapid. Besides the magnificent pile at Stonyhurst, they have colleges at Beaumont, Mount St. Mary's (Chesterfield), St. Beuno's, Liverpool, London (2), Roehampton (the novitiate), and numerous churches. According to the official lists, there are now about two hundred and fifty Jesuit fathers at work in Great Britain; besides these there are those under training and lay-brothers and on the foreign mission. Never have they been so numerous or so prosperous.

It is given to few bodies of men to have had such a golden opportunity of reforming themselves. The traditions of a little more than two hundred years, filled with disputes of which this book has been the record, were broken at the suppression. Experience and misfortune have had a chance of teaching useful lessons. It is easy after a crash, like that of 1773, to recognise the causes which lead up to it, and to see where lay the fault. The spirit of Parsons had in the past unfortunately been too long the ideal; but the restored Jesuits came back to a world which had changed and would have none of his ways. To break with a past is always a wrench; but it is often the wisest policy to conceive it possible that we have been wrong. This is the true spirit of St. Ignatius, who said: "The Society shall adapt itself to the times, and not the times to the Society.[2]

[1] The Bull restoring them in noways contradicts the accusations made against them in the Bull of Clement XIV.

[2] Genelli, p. 328.

APPENDIX

The English Jesuits until the suppression have been singularly wanting (with one exception) in any great writers whose names are known outside of their own domestic circle. Towering above them all in everything—able, fertile, if not original—stands Robert Parsons. He was their great writer, "the prince of controversialists," as Foley calls him. It will be well, in view of the rarity of his works, which at one time were of the greatest importance in English history, to give in this Appendix a *résumé* of his principal writings. These are of lasting interest as illustrating the principles which evoked them. We shall choose only such passages as will sort well with the plan of this book.

As regards Parsons' literary power there can be no two opinions. He was a master of lucid and forcible English, which is as clear to us to-day as it was to the men of his own time. He was a past-master in the art of expressing himself when he wished to do so, and in conveying an impression he hesitated to put into black and white. D'Israeli, in his *Amenities of Literature*, says:[1] "The writings of the Jesuit Parsons have attracted the notice of some of our philological critics. Parsons may be ranked among the earliest writers of our vernacular diction in its purity and pristine vigour, without ornament and polish. It is, we presume, Saxon English unblemished by an exotic phrase. It is remarkable that an author, who had passed the best part of his days abroad, and who had perfectly acquired the Spanish and Italian languages, and slightly the French, yet appears to have preserved our colloquial English from the vicissitudes of those fashionable novelties which deformed the long unsettled Elizabethan prose. To the elevation of Hooker, his imagination could never have ascended; but in clear conceptions and natural expressions, no one was his superior. His English writings have not a sentence which, to this day, is either obsolete or obscure. Swift would not have disdained his idiomatic energy. Parsons was admirably adapted to be a libeller or a polemic."

Perhaps a closer acquaintance with Parsons' writings would have

[1] Ed. 1867, p. 438.

led the amiable critic to have modified somewhat his opinion of the "Saxon English unblemished by an exotic phrase." Like so many of his Catholic contemporaries, Parsons, from the nature of the case, had a strong leaning to Latin words, and knew how to use them at times with great sonority and effect. They were particularly effective in vituperation, as we shall see. Swift's opinion, given in the *Tatler* (No. 230), is: "The writings of . . . Parsons the Jesuit . . . are in a style that with very few allowances would not offend any present reader." Here, however, we are more concerned with his matter than with his style.

I

"A Conference about the next Succession to the Crown of England, divided into two parts. Whereof the first containeth the Discourse of a Civil Lawyer, how and in what manner propinquity of blood is to be preferred. And the second, the Speech of a Temporal Lawyer about the particular titles of all such as do or may pretend, within England or without, to the next Succession.

"Whereunto is also added a new and perfect Arbor or Genealogy of the Descents of all the Kings and Princes of England from the Conquest unto this day, whereby each man's pretence is made more plain.

"Directed to the Right Honourable the Earl of Essex, of Her Majesty's Privy Council and of the noble Order of the Garter.

"Published by R. Doleman. Imprinted at N. with licence. MDXCIIII."

The preface is dated "From my chamber in Amsterdam this last of December 1593."

Something of the political creed of the author can be gained from the following extracts:—

"So of all this there can be no doubt but that the Commonwealth hath power to choose their own fashion of government, as also to change the same upon reasonable causes . . . In like manner is it evident that as the Commonwealth hath this authority to choose and change her government, so hath she also to limit the same with what laws and conditions she pleaseth, etc." (p. 12).

"Yea, not only in this point (said he) hath the Commonwealth to put back the next inheritors upon lawful considerations, but also to dispossess them that have been lawfully put into possession if they fulfil not the laws and conditions by which and from which their dignity was given them" (p. 32).

"And therefore as the whole body is of more authority than the

only head and may cure the head if it be out of tune, so may the weal publick cure or cut off their heads if they infect the rest" (p. 38).

"The power and authority which the prince hath from the Commonwealth is (in very truth) not absolute but *potestas vicaria*, or deligata as we civilians call it, etc." (p. 73).

The author's end in the book is to secure a Catholic successor. He lays down the following propositions: The chief end of a Commonwealth is the supernatural (p. 202); is religion (*ibid.*); the lack of religion is the chiefest cause to exclude a pretender (p. 212); indifference is infidelity (p. 213); it is against wisdom and policy to prefer a prince of a contrary religion (pp. 217, 218). After treating of the claims of some of the pretenders he sums up dead against the King of Scotland, and says: "I confess I have not found very many in England to favour his claim" (p. 109), and says but little to further the claim of Lady Arabella. The native claimants are also brushed aside, and Parsons set up the House of Portugal, "which containeth the claims as well of the King and Prince of Spain to the succession of England as also of the Dukes of Parma and Braganza by the House of Lancaster" (Chapter VIII.). He sums up in favour of the "great and mighty monarch" who is so good to other countries; and quotes, as a proof, the happiness of Flanders under Spanish rule.

"The Infanta is a princess of rare parts both for beauty, wisdom, and piety. The two young princes of Parma, I mean both the Duke and his brother the Cardinal, are Imps in like manner of great expectation" (p. 256).

II

"A Memorial of the Reformation of England, containing certain Notes and Advertisements, which same might be proposed in the first Parliament and National Council of our country, after God in His mercy shall restore it to the Catholic Faith for the better establishment and preservation of the said Religion. Gathered and set down by R. P. 1596."

This, one of the most interesting of his works, was not meant to be published. It was first printed in 1690 by Edward Gee, rector of St. Benedict, Paul's Wharf, from the manuscript copy presented to James II. As we have pointed out, the King attempted to follow out these lines under the influence of Father Petre, his Jesuit councillor. It will be noted how the author clears the way for the supremacy of his Society, and arranges everything on its model. It is interesting, too, as a picture of what a state would be if directed by one like Robert Parsons.

In the preface the author says: "It is no more than seventeen or

eighteen years past that the Gatherer began first to put some of them into writing, and having had the experience of the years which have ensued since, and his part also in the Catholic affairs of his country, and the practices of divers other Catholic nations abroad, he was desirous, in case that he himself should not live to see the desired day of the reduction of England, yet some of his cogitations and intentions for the publick good thereof might work some effect after his death, and that thereby other men might be the sooner moved to enter into more mature considerations of these and suchlike points: yea, and also to descend into many more particulars that here are set down . . . to advance Almighty God's glory with a holy zeal of PERFECT REFORMATION . . . And what is said in this Treatise for the Kingdom of England is meant also for Ireland, so far as it may do good, etc."

The work is divided into three parts:—

The First Chapter is entitled "Some Special Reasons why England above all the Realms ought to procure a perfect Reformation when time shall serve." Among the reasons are the following:—

England has received so many spiritual favours that a large and perfect response will be required at God's hand. The damages done by Mary not instituting a perfect reformation. To this error and ingratitude to God "all wise and godly men attribute the loss of religion again in our country" (p. 2).

As England introduced heresy into other kingdoms, "so the Reformation must needs be made first very exact and exemplar in England itself" (*ibid.*). God's providence "in continuing and holding together a good portion of the material part of the old English Catholic Church above all other nations that have been overrun with heresy . . . as, namely, we have our Cathedral churches and bishoprics yet standing, our deaneries, canonries, archdeaconries, and other benefices not destroyed, our colleges and universities whole, so that there wanteth nothing but a new form to give them life and spirit by putting good and virtuous men into them" (p. 5).

CHAPTER II. "What Manner of Reformation is needful in England."

It "ought to be very perfect, full and complete, not respecting so much what some cold Catholics use to do in other countries where spirit is decayed and corruption crept in, as what may be done or ought to be done in England" (p. 13).

England is "to receive not only the foresaid Council of Trent

entirely and fully without limitation or restraint, but to embrace also and put in use, when occasion and place is offered, such other points of reformation as tend to the perfect restitution of ecclesiastical discipline that were in use in the ancient Christian Church, though afterwards decayed for want of spirit and not urged now again nor commanded by the Council of Trent" (pp. 14–16). For in this Council "these good fathers could not frame all points to their own liking nor yet according to the rules of perfect ecclesiastical architecture" (p. 15).

"But in England no doubt but that the state of things will be far otherwise whensoever the change of religion shall happen. For then it will be lawful for a good Catholic prince that God shall send, and for a well-affected Parliament, which *himself and the time will easily procure*, to begin of new and to build from the very foundation the external face of our Catholic Church and to follow the model which themselves will choose, etc." (pp. 15, 16).

CHAPTER III. "How this Reformation may best be procured, and what Disposition of Minds is needful for it in all Parties."

Not as was done in Mary's reign; the new men were to follow quite other methods: "For that the first was huddled up in Queen Mary's days (I mean the reconciliation) by a certain general absolution, only without due search and consideration of what had been committed or what satisfaction was to be made to God and man; so was the other shuffled up with like negligence and only the external part was plastered without remedying the root, the renewing the spirit which should have been the ground of all" (p. 20).

"Many, or rather all that had abbey lands, the good Queen Mary herself and some very few others excepted, remained with the same as with a prey well gotten; and he that was most scrupulous would but sue for a Bull of Toleration to Rome upon false information, to the end that he might not be troubled; and with this he thought himself safe in conscience and bound to no more; yea, he was taken for a Catholic that would so much as ask for a Bull" (p. 21).

It is important in the new and godly reformation to cause that "great heed is to be taken, as much as may be, at the very beginning of this our reformation, to remove all occasions that are wont to breed strife and breach between the Clergy and laity; as, namely, about jurisdiction, possessions, revenues, duties, prerogatives, exemptions, and the like; all of which are to be settled with consent and good liking of all parties, as near as may be; and that which is said of this may be understood also of taking away all occasions of jars and dis-

agreeing between bishops and their chapters, religious men and priests, one order of religion with another, and suchlike persons or communities of divers states, conditions, or habits, etc." (pp. 23, 24).

Towards "weaker Catholics" and towards hereticks "there is to be used true love, piety, and Christian charity, with the prudence and direction that is also convenient" (p. 25).

CHAPTER IV. "How all sorts of People, to wit, Catholics, Schismatics, and Hereticks may be dealt withal at the next change of Religion."

There "will be necessary a sweet, pious, and prudent manner of dealing and proceeding as well with Catholics and schismatists, Protestants and persecutors" (p. 29).

While Catholics "nothing presuming of themselves . . . are to be used and employed by the Commonwealth in all principal charges and rooms and offices with special charges, every man according to his known zeal, ability, and talent" (pp. 29, 30), great care has to be shown as to others. "Men of ability and capacity only should be employed in receiving of the reconciliation at the beginning, and some particular forms were to be prescribed how it should be done, especially in great persons and subjects of great importance, and these perhaps not to be reconciled without special faculty or knowledge of the bishop or prelate of the place" (pp. 31, 32). But as for enemies or obstinate heretics, "perchance it would be good . . . not to press any man's conscience at the beginning for matters of religion for some few years . . . but yet it may be provided jointly that this toleration is only with such as live quietly and are desirous to be informed of the truth and do not teach and preach or seek to infect others . . . Yet I do give notice that my meaning is not in any way to persuade hereby that liberty of religion, to live how a man should be permitted, to any person in any Christian Commonwealth, for any cause or respect whatsoever, from which I am so far off in my judgment and affection as I think no one thing to be so dangerous, dishonourable, or more offensive to Almighty God in the world, etc." (pp. 32, 33).

"But that which I talk of is a certain connivance or toleration of magistrates, only for a certain time to be limited and with particular conditions and exceptions, that no meetings, assemblies, preachings, or perverting of others be used, but that such as be quiet and modest people and have never heard perhaps of the grounds of Catholic religion may use the freedom of their consciences to ask, learn, and to be instructed for the space prescribed, without danger of the law or of

ny inquiry to be made upon them, to inform themselves of the truth"; hereby to take away "the slander that the Church persecuteth before he instructeth" (pp. 33, 34).

After providing that public disputations in Latin should take place n London, Oxford, Cambridge, and some other fit place, he proceeds to ay down the method to be pursued with wilful apostates. " . . . how hey may be dealt withal it belongeth not to a man of my vocation o suggest, but rather to commend their state to Almighty God and heir treaty to the wisdom of such as shall be in authority in the Commonwealth at that day; admonishing them only, that as God doth not govern the whole monarchy but by rewards and chastisements, and that as He hath a sweet hand to cherish the well affected, so hath He a strong arm to bind the boisterous, stubborn, and rebellious; even so the very like and same must be the proceeding of a perfect Catholic Prince and Commonwealth; and the nearer it goes to the imitation of God's government in this and all other points the better and more exact and more durable it is and will be ever" (p. 44).

CHAPTER V. "The Forwardness that ought to be in all for the Restitution of Ecclesiastical Lands and Livings, and with what facility and ease it may be done."

After saying: "Neither is it sufficient for the security of any careful man's conscience to say that the See Apostolic has tolerated with these things in Queen Mary's time" (p. 51), Parsons goes on to lay down that "these lands . . . were not to be turned presently at the first to any particular owner that would challenge or lay claim to the same; but rather . . . were to be assigned to some common purses and Treasury, and thus to be committed to some certain Council of principal bishops and prelates and others most fit for the purpose for certain years to be limited, to gather up and dispose of all these rents, revenues, and ecclesiastical livings during the time to them assigned, for the greatest benefit of the English Church and realm . . . and this Council might be called the Council of Reformation. . . . And the reason why it were not convenient to return these lands and livings again to the same Orders of Religion, that had them before, is evident to all men; to wit, for that the times and state of England are far other, and different from what they were, when these lands were given; and consequently do require different provision and disposition of things, conformed to the present necessity and utility of the realm; as, for example, the world knoweth that the most part of all abbey lands appertained in the old time to the religion of St. Benet, of which Order

at this time there are very few of the English nation to occupy or possess the same, and to bestow them upon strangers of that religion, England having so many other necessities, were very inconvenient; and besides this it may be so that many houses and families of that Order of St. Benet or of St. Bernard or of that monastical profession (though itself most holy) will neither be possible nor necessary in England presently upon the first Reformation; but rather in place of many of them, good colleges, universities, seminaries, schools for increasing of our Clergy, as also of divers houses of other Orders that do deal more in preaching and helping of souls, and for that respect will be more necessary to the Clergy of England in this great work at the beginning and for many years after; though of the other also are not to be omitted to be planted and well provided for, according as it shall seem most expedient for God's glory, the universal good of the realm to this Council of Reformation by whose hands their lands, rents, and revenues may far more profitably be divided and employed, and with much more peace and quietness than if they should be returned to every particular Religion again" (pp. 55–57).

CHAPTER VI. "Of the many great and singular Benefits that would ensue to the Church and Realm of England by this Restitution and Disposition of Abbey Lands."

Among which he mentions there would be within a few years "more variety of religious orders, houses, abbeys, nunneries, hospitals, seminaries, and other like monuments of piety; and to the purpose for the present good of our whole realm than ever it was before the desolation thereof. . . . I say of more variety of religious monuments and more to the purpose for the present good of England; for that they would not be so great, nor so majestical, nor yet so rich, nor would be needful for the beginning, but rather in place of so great houses and those for the most part of one or two or three orders . . . there might be planted now, both of these and other orders, according to the conditions of those times, lesser houses with smaller rents and numbers of people, but with more perfection of reformation, edification, and help to the gaining of souls than before; and these houses might be most multiplied that should be seen to be most profitable to this effect" (pp. 63, 64).

"Wherefore this point of restoring abbey lands with the moderation which I have said is to be holpen, set forward, and urged most earnestly by all such as have God's zeal in them and desire a good reformation in England. And whosoever should be contrary or backward

in this matter, either for his own interest, or for his friends, or of vain fear, policy, coldness, or lack of fervour, he were not to be heard, seeing the reason alleged for it; . . . but even the Prince and Catholic King that God shall give us, and His Holiness also, were to be prevented in this point as the most principal and important for all our work" (pp. 65, 66).

The money alienated from the secular Clergy is not to go, as with the abbey lands, to the Common Purse, but is to be returned to them, "yet with the limitation, order, and reformation that the Council, designed for this purpose, shall think best and most expedient" (p. 68).

Advowsons, impropriate parsonages, patronages, "for that in truth they were taken from the livings and revenues of pastors and curates at the beginning and are part of the revenues, it seemeth more reason that they should be accepted rather ecclesiastical than monastical livings, etc." (pp. 68, 69).

CHAPTER VII. "Of a Council of Reformation, and wherein they are principally to be occupied."

This is the author's chief point.

". . . nothing will be of so much moment as to have certain, prudent, and zealous men put in authority by the Prince, and Parliament, and Pope's Holiness, to attend principally, and as it were only to this affair, as to be bound to give a continual account of what they do in the same. And for that the name of Inquisition may be somewhat odious and offensive at the beginning, perhaps it would not be amiss to name these men a Council of Reformation, and that their authority might be limited for some certain number of years, as four, five, or six, as it should be thought most convenient and sufficient, for the setting up and establishing of the English Church" (p. 70).

This Inquisition (for it was that in all but name) was to sit in London and to consist of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Winchester, London, and Rochester; "And with these men might be joined other principal and skilful, either bishops or others, as should be thought best, etc." (p. 71).

Their first duty was to gather in restitutions into one common purse; also "collections and custody of all other ecclesiastical rents and revenues throughout England" (p. 72).

From this, "allowing so much to be spent in every parish as shall be thought needful, they may reduce the remnant to the aforesaid common purse." . . . "And in the mean space, the best means of supplying the common spiritual needs of England would be perhaps, that no priest, besides bishops, deans, archdeacons and the like (that are needful

for the government of the rest) should have any particular assignation or interest in any benefice; but only a sufficient pension allowed him by the Council of Reformation or bishop of the diocese, etc." If they were afterwards to be placed in benefices it should be "with this express proviso and condition, that they may be removed again from the same benefice to a worse or to none at all, if they give not satisfaction in their functions; which only bridle may chance to do more good than all the laws and exhortations in the world; and it would be good sometimes to put it into execution, to promote some in higher benefices, and thrust down others to lower, by way of visitation, when cause is offered" (pp. 73, 74).

To keep away inconvenient people from the happy pastures of the English Church, Parsons provides that at the beginning the Inquisition "do publish an edict or proclamation, with all severity, commanding, under pain of punishment, that no religious or ecclesiastical persons whatsoever do enter into the realm without presenting himself before the Council within so many days after his entrance, and there to show the cause why he cometh, and the licence and authority by which he cometh, and to stand to the determination of the Council for his abode or departure again; for if this be not done and observed with all rigour, many scandalous, light, and inconstant people, partly upon novelty, and partly upon hopes to gain, will repair presently to England and do great hurt by their example" (pp. 74, 75).

"In the beginning of religious houses in England, care may be had that such be builded and most multiplied as be most needful and profitable for the time present, and do apply their labours to action and to the help also of others; and that before all the rest, seminaries and colleges be built and put in order, for the more ease of our Clergy" (p. 77).

"It were also to be considered whether some new military order of knights were to be erected in our realm for exercise and help of our young gentlemen and nobility as in other countries we see it" (p. 78). These knights should be employed in fighting against heretics anywhere, in keeping the seas from pirates and the land from public theft. They were to be formed upon the model of the Holy Hermandad of Spain.

CHAPTER VIII. "Of divers other Points that will belong to the Council of the Reformation to deal in."

Inquisitors were to be sent into all shires to advise what were the greatest needs; the best means of supplying immediate wants are

suggested by the author. The calendar is to be revised, and fewer feast days to be kept. He proposes that Holy Days might be observed only for the forenoon. Gilds and Confraternities were to be established everywhere. Also: "Some such officer as the Romans called their Censor, to look that no man lived idly, nor brought up his children without some exercise and means to live, would be of importance for this reformation. And this man might call to account also such men as lived suspiciously or scandalously, as by carding and dicing, or spent riotously any way his own goods or his wife's" (p. 89).

Among its other duties the Inquisition will have to see to the universities; and to the legal body, with the purpose of bringing about a redress of the common law.

A third university in the northern part of England should be established, "for the better polishing of those parts towards Scotland" (p. 91); and he recommends a third archbishopric to be appointed at Bristol, and the other Sees to be increased or rearranged.

Chapter IX. "There ensue more Matters that appertain to the Council of Reformation."

"Public and private libraries must be searched and examined for books, as also all bookbinders, stationers, and booksellers' shops"; and all bad books of any kind "burnt (and) suppressed, and severe order and punishment appointed for such as shall conceal these kind of writings; and like order set down for printing of good things for the time to come" (pp. 94, 95).

"A poor man's bank or treasury" to be set up in all large towns. Hospitals to be duly visited and kept "fine, cleanly, and handsome." Prisons are to be enlarged. Tybourne to become a place of pilgrimages, with a chapel served perhaps by capuchins (pp. 94–98).

Before the Council of Reformation comes to an end: "it would be very much necessary that they should leave some good and sound manner of Inquisition established for the conservation of that which they have planted: for that, during the time of their authority, perhaps it would be best to spare the name of Inquisition at the first beginning . . . but afterwards it will be necessary to bring it in, either by that or some other name, as should be thought most convenient for the time; for that without this care, all will slide down and fall again. What form or manner of Inquisition to bring in, whether that of Spain (whose rigour is misliked by some), or that which is used in divers parts of Italy (whose coldness is reprehended by more), or that of Rome itself, which seemeth to take a kind of middle way between both,

is not so easy to determine; but the time itself will speak, when the day shall come, and perhaps some mixture of all will not be amiss for England; and as for divers points of the diligent and exact manner of proceeding in Spain, they are so necessary, as without them, no matter of moment can be expected, etc." (pp. 98, 99).

He praises the Spanish system of the treatment of religious criminals as "more attention is to be had to this, for that it is the gain of their souls, than to the execution only of punishments assigned by ecclesiastical canons, though this also is to be done, and that with resolution, as before hath been said, when the former sweet means by no way will take place" (p. 100).

CHAPTER X. "Of the Parliament of England, and what were to be considered, or reformed about the same, or by the same."

A commission was to decide the number and quality of those voting in the two Houses; the burgesses to be restrained to the greater towns and cities. Clerics, such as deans, archdeacons, heads of colleges and provincials, to be admitted to the Lower House.

Regarding the election of members, the bishops were to have the power of negativing or of confirming elections; and each member before taking his seat had to make the profession of faith. At the beginning of Parliament it was to be made for ever treason for any man to purpose anything for the introduction of heresy.

In procedure: voting was to be by balls; a committee to examine all proposed bills. Three days' discussion only to be allowed upon a bill; only two persons to be allowed to speak for and against a bill.

The Parliament were to be charged "to restore and to put in full authority again all old laws that ever were in use in England in favour of the (Catholic Church) and against heresies and heretics" (p. 107). The law of Mortmain was, for a time at least, to be repealed, and the question of Elizabeth's legitimacy, at least since the sentence of Pius v., was to be examined. All deeds not manifestly wrong, executed by her, were to be condoned; but her gifts, donations of livings, titles, honours, and offices to be *ipso facto* void, unless they were made to Catholics.

One more question to be considered was: whether the Parliaments, "by reason of the want of bishops," have been good and lawful.

THE SECOND PART OF THE MEMORIAL TOUCHING THE CLERGY.

CHAPTER I. "Of the Clergy in general; what they are and what they ought to do at the next change."

After saying that the state of the Clergy "after a long desired reduction and happy entrance of some Catholic prince over us" (p. 114) would be like that of Constantine's time both as to goodness and also to "divisions, emulation, and contentions," great care will be necessary in their treatment. They are to receive meat and competent maintenance, and seek nothing further (p. 117). "So as my hope is that our Clergy in every degree, from the highest to the lowest, will endeavour at that day to conform themselves to all the rules of Reason, Piety, and Religion, and to hearken gladly to any good counsel or remembrance of order and discipline that shall be offered for theirs and the common good, etc." (p. 118).

CHAPTER II. "Of Bishops and Bishoprics in England."

"The authority and jurisdiction of bishops in England," as it is extended to "dishonesty of life or suspicion thereof . . . is for this cause to be continued or increased. And albeit, in some other countries, simple fornication is not so much punished, or pursued and inquired upon, and that the stews also be permitted for avoiding of greater inconveniences in respect of the different natures and complexions of the people; yet by experience we do find that the same necessity of liberty is not in England, and consequently in nowise to be brought in again; for that it is an occasion of fall and of grievous temptation to many that otherwise would not have them" (p. 120).

"That English custom also of often visitations . . . and probate of testament, etc. . . . is very laudable and to be honoured . . . and if for a time, after the next change, some hand were given to bishops also in temporal affairs, as to be principal in all public commissions within the shire, it would greatly authorise Religion and assure the country much more to the prince" (pp. 120, 121).

The episcopal revenues are to be in the hands of the Council of Reformation, and are to be "sufficient with moderation" (p. 121). The bishops are not to have "gorgeous apparel, great troops of servants, rich furniture of household stuffs and other ostentation of this quality": and no "hawking, hunting, dicing, carding, banqueting, enriching of kindred and the like" (p. 123). "All kinds of access and ordinary residence or

traffic of women within a prelate's house for any occasion whatsoever, whether they be kindred or not, is indecent, suspicious, and full of disedification, except it were only upon some known cause, suit, or particular business without stay, which ought to be avoided the most that may be" (p. 126).

The rich and influential are especially to be encouraged, "by courteous entreaty and often inviting of them" (p. 129). All ("bishops in respect to Clergy, archbishops in respect to bishops, and the Prince in respect to all") should have their lists of those worthy of promotion or otherwise (p. 131). Livings were to go by opposition and trials. Patrons are not to present the persons nor give advowsons (p. 132). Benefices are to be given and taken upon this express condition: "That upon merit or demerit, they may be changed, or taken away, and the parties removed either to a higher or lower benefice, or none at all if he deserveth it" (p. 133); and the same to apply to bishops, archbishops, deans, and other prelates. "And that sometimes it be put into execution, for that this will be a continual bridle and spur to them when they know they have no certainty or perpetuity, etc." (p. 134).

Chapter III. "Of Deans, Canons, Pastors, Curates, and the rest of the Clergy."

The Chapter to live by rule and in community as regular canons (p. 137). Reconverted persons, as public sinners, should only be allowed to enter the Church as in the old discipline (p. 142). "And whether it shall be fit at that day to disable some great and able heretics, and their posterity, especially if they have been principal authors in the overthrowing of the Catholic Religion or known persecutors of the same, not only from priesthood and ecclesiastical dignities, but also from all other honours and preferments temporal of the Commonwealth, for warning and deterring of others, and for the more security of the said Weal Public, the wiser sort of that time may put in consideration" (pp. 142, 143). Seminaries are to be the great panacea of the ills of the Clergy; and all have to be brought up under this system (p. 144). Their dress "is to be reduced also to the measure and proportion of that perfection and edification which we desire to see in our priests at the next change, and that both vanity and novelty be avoided then, and, above all, lightness and dissolution, etc." (p. 147).

Chapter IV. "Of Seminaries, Colleges, Universities, and Schools."

Seminaries to be erected in London "for the help of our neighbours oppressed or infected with heresy, as, namely, Denmark, divers parts near

to us of Germany, Poland, Gothland, Sweedland, Scotland, Muscovy, and the Isles of Zeland" (pp. 149, 150). As regards the Universities, a commission is to be appointed of "certain men of experience, learning, and wisdom . . . to see what is to be convenient to be ordained for these effects and times, and for reducing of our Universities to the best utility of our Commonwealth" (p. 152). The multitude of oaths in vogue in the Universities are to be abolished. "The reading of Sciences in particular colleges doth greatly hurt and hinder the public profit of students in their learning" (p. 153), therefore only public lectures in public schools by public readers are to be allowed; and in place of private readers there should be appointed "repetitors" in every college (p. 154). Four lecturers are to be appointed in Divinity, two in School Doctrine, one for Scripture, and one for Casuistry; three others for Civil Law; two for Physic, besides lecturers on the Herbal and Anatomy. Canon Law to be read with the Civil; and a course of Philosophy to precede all other degrees (pp. 156–158). In the local grammar schools only one master and perhaps one usher; and "the inconvenience of overmuch beating of children taken away, which is another disorder of our Grammar Schools" (p. 160).

CHAPTER V. "Of Government, Discipline, and Manner of Proceeding of English Universities."

All "junkets, all lascivious banquetings, excess of apparel, dancing, fencing schools and the like," are to be forbidden; and "no man have leave to go forth but by knowledge and licence of his superior, and this to known honest parts and persons, at houses lawful, accompanied with his fellow, or more if need be, in decent apparel, etc." (p. 166).

All offices in the Universities "be made void at the beginning, and new men planted and placed again upon choice, etc." (p. 168), and the headship of houses should never be given for life but for three years, and their allowances to be cut down (p. 170, etc.).

CHAPTER VI. "How Fellowships, Scholarships, and other such Places were to be proved."

CHAPTER VII. "Of Religious Men and Women, and Matters appertaining unto them."

"All emulation and contention among religious orders must be carefully avoided at that day, whereunto it seemeth that two things will greatly help: first, that no religious be admitted but reformed, as hath

been said; for that between good and perfect men there is never emulation or contention"; and secondly, that the Church lands should be distributed "without respect of former possessors" (pp. 187, 190).

The Third Part of the Memorial appertaining to the Laity.

Chapter I. "Of the Laity or Temporalty in general."

This treats of the superiority of the Spirituality.

Chapter II. "Of the Prince and his Council, and matters belonging to them."

Besides the temporal council, the prince is to have, as in Portugal, another council, "of learned spiritual men, named the Table of Conscience" (p. 205), the head of which is commonly the King's confessor (p. 206). Such an aid would have a good effect upon the world, as the prince would act "by the direction of so irreprehensible a consultation" (p. 206).

It were "to be wished that the rigour of our temporal laws for putting men to death, for theft of so small a quantity, or value, as is accustomed in England, were much moderated, and some lesser bodily punishments invented for that purpose." The method of conducting cases is also to be improved (pp. 212, 213).

The prince is warned that "in such manner must he link the state of Catholic religion and succession together, as the one may depend and be the assurance of the other" (p. 214).

The King's confessor is to be the channel through which promotions and the fair fame of others is to be conducted (p. 217). The art of brotherly correction is to be cultivated.

Chapter III. "Of the Nobility and Gentry of England, and matters appertaining to their Estates."

"Hawking, hunting, keeping of great houses, many servants, much hospitality . . . being old customs of their ancestors," are to be continued (p. 223).

A reasonable portion is to be secured to the younger children, and the younger sons of the nobility are to be induced to go into the Church, "wherein they are preferred before others in authority and dignity, if their merits of learning and virtue be equal, etc." (p. 228).

Parliament should be called upon to limit the dowries given in marriages. Married women's property is to be enjoyed by the husband only as a life-rent (p. 230), and, in defect of children, she may dispose by secret testament of her property as she wills. Some suggestions are then given as to the relations of landlord and tenant.

CHAPTER IV. "Of the Inns of Court, and study of the Common Law of England, and of the Laws themselves."

CHAPTER V. "Of the Commons of England, and matters appertaining unto them."

A commoner is not to be allowed lightly to pass from his class to that of gentleman without great cause, "and not only by way of wealth, as of late years hath been accustomed" (p. 257).

"No village lightly should be passed without a master in it to teach the children to write and read at the least, and to cast accounts and to know the Christian Doctrine, etc." (pp. 260, 261).

III

"A BRIEFE APOLOGIE OR DEFENCE of the Catholike Ecclesiastical Hierarchie and Subordination in England, erected these later yeers by our holy Father Pope Clement the eight; and impugned by certaine libels printed and published of late both in Latine and English; by some unquiet persons under the name of Priests of the Seminaries. *Written and set forth for the true information and stay of all good Catholikes by Priestes united in due subordination to the right Reverend Archpriest and other their Superiors.*"

HEB. 13, ver. 17.

Obedite præpositis vestris subjacete eis.
Obey your Superiors and submit yourselves unto them.

1 THESS. 5.

Rogamus vos fratres, corripite inquietos.
We beseech you, brethren, represse those that are unquiet amongst you.

"Permissu Superiorum."

The date of the preface is 1st July 1601. Father Parsons complains that the Appellants printed books "without particular names of the

authors, without licence of superiors and other circumstances of modesty, right and conscience required in such attempts" (p. 9). This very book comes out without the author's name and under a false title. It is a Brief Apology for Fr. Parsons, and is written with the disregard for facts which characterise the author. Simultaneously with this comes out a Latin version for use in Rome. The title-page runs as follows :—

IV

"APOLOGIA PRO HIERARCHI ECCLESIASTICA. A.S.D.N. Clemente PP. VIII. his annis apud Anglos instituta. Qua sacerdotum quorundam, eandem libellis ac scriptis contentiosis impugnantium, temeritas coarguitur et legitimi superioris authoritas defenditur. *Scripta ab iis sacerdotibus, qui archipresbytero parent et debitum suæ sanctitatis ordinationi exhibent.*"

HEB. 13, ver. 17.

Obedite præpositis vestris et subjacete eis.

1 THESS. 5.

Rogamus vos fratres, corripite inquietos.

"Permissu Superiorum."

There is no date on the title-page; but the letter dedicated to the Pope, in the name of the priests of England, is dated 20th July 1601. In this letter Parsons gives the Pope a *résumé* of the disputes "for greater light upon the whole question and controversy." In speaking of the troubles at the English college and the visitation of Sega, he states: that ambition, jealousy, and the unquiet minds of some, egged on by the heretics, were found, by Sega, to be the one and only cause of all the trouble. True, Sega so reports; but Parsons from his own letter to Holt (see p. 203, etc., *ante*) does not say anything like this. It will be worth while comparing the two statements. Here is a case where he did not scruple in controversy to use an argument he knew was not sound. He tells the Pope that only a few priests (not the twentieth part of the English Clergy), and therefore the greater part of those who were formerly disorderly at Rome, have dared to oppose the appointment of the Archpriest (p. 157). To this version, which was evidently not strong enough for his purpose, he added an appendix of 197 pages.

V

"APPENDIX AD APOLOGIAM pro Hierarchia Ecclesiastica. A.S^mo^ D.N. Clemente Papa VIII. apud Anglos instituta. *Qua Latinus ejusdem Apologiæ interpres R.G. judicium suum censuramque fert de octo libellis famosis sub inquietorum presbyterorum nomine recens in lucem editis.*"

2 TIM. 4.

Argue, observa, increpa.

PROV. 27.

Meliora sunt vulnera diligentis quam fraudulenta oscula odientis.

"Permissu Superiorum. *Anno* MXCII."

Its contents may be gathered from the heading of its chapters.

I. "Of the Scandalous Dealings of the unquiet Priests with the Enemies of the Faith against Catholics."
II. "Of their Pernicious Paradoxes against the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff."
III. "Of the incredible and plainly proposed Boldness of the unquiet who are not ashamed to pursue in unworthy ways the supreme Pontiffs, the illustrious Cardinals, and other principal men."
IV. "Of the English Martyrs calumniated and accused of Crimes by these Disturbers."
V. "Of the manifold Lies of these unruly which not seldom contradict themselves."
VI. "Of the scurrility and filthy speaking of these noisy ones."

197 pages.

VI

"A Manifestation of the Great Folly and Bad Spirit of certayne in England calling themselves Secular Priestes *who set forth dayly most infamous and contumelious libels against worthy men of their own religion and divers of them their lawful Superiors, of which libels sundry are here examined and refuted.* By Priests living in Obedience."

2 Tim. 3.

"Their folly shalbe manifest to all men."

Luc 11.

"The unclean spirit went foorth and took seaven other spirits, more wicked then himself and all entring dwelt there, and the ending of those men was worse then the beginning."

"Superiorum Permissu. 1602."

This book, written anonymously, has two purposes: to defend himself, and to detract from the characters of the four envoys at Rome and their cause. It teems with invective and wilful misstatements. At the end of *A Reply to Fr. Parsons' Libel*, by W. C., is "a Table of the Passionate and Uncharitable Words and Sentences used by Fr. Parsons in his Libel of Manifestation, as well against our persons as our actions and proceedings, with the chapter and leaf noted where you may see them." The last runs to twelve pages. A specimen from page 93 of the *Manifestation* will be enough to understand his method of controversy.

"And here now the very multitude of these outrageous libels, with the immensity of hatred, hellish spirit, and poisoned entrails, discovered therein, do force us against our former purpose to cut off and stay all further passage and proceeding, in this horrible puddle of lies, slanderous invectives, and devilish detraction; for that the very looking them over doth weary the heart of any true Christian; and consequently whereas before we had determined with ourselves to give you some taste or examples out of them all, yet now finding the multitude to be without end and the quality so base, vile, and malicious, as the venom of any lost or loose tongue, armed with audacity and defended with impudency, stirred up with envy and enraged with fury and bounded no ways by any limits of conscience, piety, or fear of God, can vomit or cast out to defame their brethren: finding this (we say) we have thought good to cease here without further stirring the loathsome rags of so filthy a dunghill." [1]

[1] No wonder the late Fr. Morris, S.J., said: "It is to be profoundly regretted that Fr. Parsons should have allowed himself to make such terrible accusations against the personal character of his opponents . . . Still, considering all that can be alleged, the language used by him is, if I may be allowed to judge so great a man, absolutely indefensible. It seems to have been impolitic likewise . . . But on this point of hard, uncharitable language I, for one, cannot be the defender of Fr. Parsons, and, indeed, I look upon it with the deepest regret and concern" (*Dublin Review*, April 1890, p. 253).

VII

"A Treatise tending to Mitigation towards Catholicke Subjectes in England.

"Wherein is declared, that it is not impossible for subjects of different Religion (especially Catholickes and Protestantes) to live togeather in dutifull obedience and subjection, under the government of His Majesty of Great Britany. Against the seditious wrytings of Thomas Morton, Minister, & some others to the contrary.

"Whose two false and slaunderous groundes, pretended to be drawne from Catholicke doctrine and practice, concerning Rebellion and Equivocation are overthrowne and cast upon himselfe. Dedicated to the learned Schoole-Divines, Cyvill and Canon Lawyers of the two Universities of England. By P. R."

PROV. 26, vers. 20.

Susurrone subtracto, iurgia conquiescunt.
The make-bate being removed, brawles do cease.

"Permissu Superiorum. 1607."

"The Epistle dedicatory" is followed by a Preface "To all true-harted Englishmen," etc. The first part on Rebellion extends from p. 31 to p. 272; while that on Equivocation from p. 273 to p. 544. The whole closing with "a briefe exhortation unto Catholics not to use the liberty of Equivocation, even in lawful cases, but where some urgent occasion induceth them thereunto" (pp. 545–556).

On the subject of Equivocation Parsons writes:

". . . we hold that Equivocation is no lie at all, nor can be (except it pass from the nature of Equivocation as after shall be showed), etc." (p. 277).

"We hold that no kind of lie is lawful at all, nor that ever for any cause, utility, or necessity it may be made lawful as after abundantly shall be declared. And again we hold that some kind of Equivocation in some cases may be lawful, etc." (*ibid.*).

"Catholic doctrine doth allow Equivocation, but in certain particular cases, either for defence of obliged secret, or of innocency, justice and the like, which cases afterward shall be explained: It addeth also certain prescript circumstances, as that it be not in matters of faith, nor in buying, selling, or common human traffic to the hurt or prejudice of

any man, and especially that the speech be not false in itself in th meaning of the speaker, etc." (p. 277).

Mental reservations are not strictly equivocations. The prope term is amphibology. He thus defines a mental reservation: An mixed proposition partly delivered with mouth and partly conceive in mind, so that the reserved clause do agree with my mind be i whatsoever I please to fancy to myself, and gives the following a an example. In reply to an unlawful judge a priest might say ou loud: "I am no priest," adding to himself, "so as I am bound t utter it unto you."

"Neither is this to deceive another, but to permit him that offereth me injury and is no superior of mine in that cause to be deceived by my doubtful speech and by concealing that which I am not bound to utter unto him, etc." (p. 342).

"Now then in this our case we do affirm that there is no lie o untruth avouched at all, but only a concealment of that truth which I am not bound to utter unto him that demandeth it unjustly" (p. 345).

". . . it is evident that my intention is not to deceive in this proposition but to defend myself against the captious and injurious demands of an unlawful judge, I speaking a truth in itself according to my meaning, though he taking it otherwise is deceived thereby, but without any fault of mine" (p. 346).

"But now when the judge is not lawful or not competent at least in that cause, or proceedeth not lawfully, then all these aforesaid obligations do cease in the defendant" (p. 415).

The conclusion of the whole work is: "My wish and counsel to Catholics should be to use the benefit of this liberty most sparingly even in lawful things, and never but upon great and urgent causes and occasions." And the reason of this my wish and counsel are—"(1) avoidance of scandal, (2) and regard for the present time" (p. 546).

INDEX

bott, Archbishop: 23.
ington, Thomas: 302, 306, 307.
arisio, Signor: 256.
ams, Fr.: 238.
da, Ferdinand d': 448–451, note.
azzari, Fr.: rector at Rome, 36; on Allen's death, 127, note; on the Roman proils, 179.
reement with the Clergy: 426.
echi, Cardinal: 431.
calà: Jesuits at, 332, note.
lred, Solomon: 225.
nçon, Duke of: and Elizabeth, 68; prefers tennis to Campion, 83.
xander V.: 2.
xander VI.: 4.
xander VII.: 431, 435.
egiance and heresy: 149.
egiance, Oath of: *See* Oath.
en, William: and Douai Seminary, 34; goes to Rome, 42; his seminary a hindrance to Jesuit plans, 72; is therefore to be made cardinal, *ibid.*; and politics, 76; protests his loyalty, *ibid.*; defends the Jesuits, *ibid.*; is to be "hispaniolated," 77; refuses the cardinalate, 98; is to be made bishop of Durham, *ibid.*, 99; his cardinalate, 102, 113, 121; and Parsons, *ibid.*; recommends him to the Pope, 206; appointed bishop of Durham, 207; called to Rome by the Jesuits, 212; a tool in Parsons' hands, 119; and treasonable practices, 120, note; made cardinal, 127; real cause of, *ibid.*; quarrels with the Society, *ibid.*, 232; dislikes Parsons' courses, *ibid.*, 133; to be made archbishop of Malines, *ibid.*; his death, suspicious, *ibid.*; refutes the truth, 141; to be discharged from English affairs, 143; stirs up Philip II., 145.
Saints: the hymn for, 301.
n: his cruelties, 19, 26.
bition of Jesuits: 11, 460, 461.
lrewes, Bishop: caustic remark of, 191.
Anglican Bishop: and recusants, 66.
Angus, Earl of: letter to, 277.
Annales Collegii Anglorum: 334.
Annual Letters: 419, 438.
Answer to Sir Edward Coke: 385.
Anti-Jesuit movement: in England, 171–177; in Rome, 177–180; in Flanders, 180.
Anti-Jesuit party: in Rome, 40.
Anti-Popes: 1.
Apologie for the Seminaries, An: 76.
Apologie, A Briefe: 260, 491.
Appeal, a piteous: 356.
Appellant Controversy: 245–257; and Paris University, 257; and Bancroft, 258, 267; the result of, 270; persevered in, 272.
Aquaviva, Claude: volunteers for English Mission, 44; and Parsons, 86; views on government, 102–3; manages Sixtus V., 130–2; rejects the Pope's counsels, 131; and the General Congregations, 152; writes to Garnett, 291; regulates the Mission, 368; his diplomacy, 458.
Archpriest: suggested, 43; Parsons on, 214; professed reasons for the appointment, 215; bound to the Jesuits, *ibid.*; not the Pope's institution, 216; "a most sweet form of government," 245; to be reprimanded, 268; removed, 356; and the Jesuits, 366; a monument of defeat, *ibid.* *See also under* Blackwell, Birkhead, *and* Harrison.
Arlington, Lord: 437.
Armada, The: defeat of, and Catholics, 128, note.
Arrigoni, Cardinal: 371.
Arrowsmith, Fr.: 407; seized, 408; executed, 409; "Holy Hand," 410.
Arundel House: meeting at, 433.
Arundel, Lord: his troop disbanded, 349; and Charles II., 457.
Association, The Clergy: 211; its objects, 212; opposed by the Jesuits, *ibid.*; rules sent to Parsons, *ibid.*
Aubigny, d': protects the Jesuits, 434; to be made cardinal, 435.

any man, and especially that the speech be not false in itself in th meaning of the speaker, etc." (p. 277).

Mental reservations are not strictly equivocations. The prope term is amphibology. He thus defines a mental reservation: An mixed proposition partly delivered with mouth and partly conceive in mind, so that the reserved clause do agree with my mind be whatsoever I please to fancy to myself, and gives the following a an example. In reply to an unlawful judge a priest might say ou loud: "I am no priest," adding to himself, "so as I am bound t utter it unto you."

"Neither is this to deceive another, but to permit him that offereth me injury and is no superior of mine in that cause to be deceived by my doubtful speech and by concealing that which I am not bound t utter unto him, etc." (p. 342).

"Now then in this our case we do affirm that there is no lie o untruth avouched at all, but only a concealment of that truth which am not bound to utter unto him that demandeth it unjustly" (p. 345).

". . . it is evident that my intention is not to deceive in thi proposition but to defend myself against the captious and injurious demands of an unlawful judge, I speaking a truth in itself according to my meaning, though he taking it otherwise is deceived thereby, bu without any fault of mine" (p. 346).

"But now when the judge is not lawful or not competent at leas in that cause, or proceedeth not lawfully, then all these aforesaid obliga tions do cease in the defendant" (p. 415).

The conclusion of the whole work is: "My wish and counsel t Catholics should be to use the benefit of this liberty most sparingly even in lawful things, and never but upon great and urgent causes and occasions." And the reason of this my wish and counsel are—"(1) avoidance of scandal, (2) and regard for the present time" (p. 546).

INDEX

bbott, Archbishop: 23.
bington, Thomas: 302, 306, 307.
barisio, Signor: 256.
Adams, Fr.: 238.
Alda, Ferdinand d': 448–451, note.
Alazzari, Fr.: rector at Rome, 36; on Allen's death, 127, note; on the Roman broils, 179.
Agreement with the Clergy: 426.
Albechi, Cardinal: 431.
Alcalà: Jesuits at, 332, note.
Aldred, Solomon: 225.
Alençon, Duke of: and Elizabeth, 68; prefers tennis to Campion, 83.
Alexander V.: 2.
Alexander VI.: 4.
Alexander VII.: 431, 435.
Allegiance and heresy: 149.
Allegiance, Oath of: *See* Oath.
Allen, William: and Douai Seminary, 34; goes to Rome, 42; his seminary a hindrance to Jesuit plans, 72; is therefore to be made cardinal, *ibid.*; and politics, 76; protests his loyalty, *ibid.*; defends the Jesuits, *ibid.*; is to be "hispaniolated," 77; refuses the cardinalate, 98; is to be made bishop of Durham, *ibid.*, 99; his cardinalate, 102, 113, 121; and Parsons, *ibid.*; recommends him to the Pope, 106; appointed bishop of Durham, 107; called to Rome by the Jesuits, 112; a tool in Parsons' hands, 119; and treasonable practices, 120, note; made cardinal, 127; real cause of, *ibid.*; quarrels with the Society, *ibid.*, 132; dislikes Parsons' courses, *ibid.*, 133; to be made archbishop of Malines, *ibid.*; his death, suspicious, *ibid.*; refutes the truth, 141; to be discharged from English affairs, 143; stirs up Philip II., 145.
All Saints: the hymn for, 301.
Alva: his cruelties, 19, 26.
Ambition of Jesuits: 11, 460, 461.
Andrewes, Bishop: caustic remark of, 391.
Anglican Bishop: and recusants, 66.
Angus, Earl of: letter to, 277.
Annales Collegii Anglorum: 334.
Annual Letters: 419, 438.
Answer to Sir Edward Coke: 385.
Anti-Jesuit movement: in England, 171–177; in Rome, 177–180; in Flanders, 180.
Anti-Jesuit party: in Rome, 40.
Anti-Popes: 1.
Apologie for the Seminaries, An: 76.
Apologie, A Briefe: 260, 491.
Appeal, a piteous: 356.
Appellant Controversy: 245–257; and Paris University, 257; and Bancroft, 258, 267; the result of, 270; persevered in, 272.
Aquaviva, Claude: volunteers for English Mission, 44; and Parsons, 86; views on government, 102–3; manages Sixtus V., 130–2; rejects the Pope's counsels, 131; and the General Congregations, 152; writes to Garnett, 291; regulates the Mission, 368; his diplomacy, 458.
Archpriest: suggested, 43; Parsons on, 214; professed reasons for the appointment, 215; bound to the Jesuits, *ibid.*; not the Pope's institution, 216; "a most sweet form of government," 245; to be reprimanded, 268; removed, 356; and the Jesuits, 366; a monument of defeat, *ibid.* *See also under* Blackwell, Birkhead, *and* Harrison.
Arlington, Lord: 437.
Armada, The: defeat of, and Catholics, 128, note.
Arrigoni, Cardinal: 371.
Arrowsmith, Fr.: 407; seized, 408; executed, 409; "Holy Hand," 410.
Arundel House: meeting at, 433.
Arundel, Lord: his troop disbanded, 349; and Charles II., 457.
Association, The Clergy: 211; its objects, 212; opposed by the Jesuits, *ibid.*; rules sent to Parsons, *ibid.*
Aubigny, d': protects the Jesuits, 434; to be made cardinal, 435.

Augustinians: at Taunton, 14.
Aurelius, Petrus: 420.
Authority, principle of: weakened, 1; must be based on Conscience, 172.
Avignon: seventy years' captivity at, 1; Gregory XI. leaves, *ibid.*
Aylmer, Bishop: his brutal remark, 460.

Babington Plot: 174.
Bacon, Lord Keeper: on the Jesuits, 411.
Bagshawe, Christopher: and Parsons, 21; accuses Parsons, 22; his *True Relation*, 173; defended by Garnett, 177; one of the Envoys, 259; remains in Paris, 260; Parsons' opinion of, 263.
Baldwin, Fr.: his craft, 230; superintends at Brussels, 239; "a nimble-headed stifler," *ibid.* note, 241; and Guy Fawkes, 282.
Baltimore, Lord: 431.
Bancroft, Bishop: on Parsons, 253, note; and the Appellant Controversy, 258; and Bluet, 259; on the Appeal, 273; *as archbishop*, on the Oath, 351.
Bandini, Cardinal: befriends the Clergy, 410.
Barcos, de: 420.
Barkworth, Mark: and the Jesuits, 335–6; cruel treatment of, *ibid.*
Barlow, Dom Rudisind: the *Mandatum*, 413.
Barnby, one of the Envoys, 259.
Barrett, Dr.: on the cause of the Roman broils, 179.
Βασιλικον δωρον: comforts Parsons, 283.
Bastard, a royal: joins the Society, 435; visits Charles II., 436.
Bates: Catesby's servant, 295, note.
Bedingfield, Fr: *See* Mumford.
Bedloe: another scoundrel, 442.
Bell, Henry: enthusiastic letter of, 134, note.
Bellamy, Anne: and Topcliffe, 169.
Bellarmine, Cardinal: on the seal of Confession, 298; on the Oath, 353; Memorial to, 355.
Bellasis, Lord: 437.
Belling, Secretary: his mission to Rome, 435.
Benedictine Abbat, A: befriends Parsons, 136, 192, 193.
Benedictines, The: and Jesuits, 12, 43; and Parsons, 333; break the barriers, *ibid.*; no lovers of novelty, 332, 349, 350; Jesuit dislike of, 350; with Jesuits at the Savoy, 445; and at St. Edmundsbury, 446 and note; accused of Jansenism, 468.
Bennett, John: his agency, 343, 344, 40 a letter from, 200.
Bergamo: Nuncio in Flanders, 117.
Berington, Rev. J.: his honesty vindicate 419.
Bernard, St.: his warning to the Pope,
Bill against Jesuits: 71.
Birkhead, George: 356; begins to mi trust Parsons, 374; rebels against hir 380, 381; his last letter to the Jesuit 401.
Bishop, Dr. William: 245, 251, 25 258; as *Bishop of Chalcedon*, 411; a the Jesuits, 412; institutes a chapte *ibid.*; dies, *ibid.*
Bishops and the Jesuits: 10.
Bishops, The Seven: 459.
Black Canons of Taunton: 14.
Blackfan, Fr.: 334; and the student 337–8; and Creswell, 343; a Lisbon Seminary, *ibid.*, 401.
Blackwell, George: unfavourable to t Jesuit Mission, 56; eulogises t Jesuits, 213; appointed Archpries 214; and the Clergy, 244, 252, 25 257; resents the appeal, 245; his gre mistake, 255; supported by the Jesuit *ibid.*; threatens Colleton, 256; a the Jesuits, *ibid.*; the "Customer," 25 and Bluet, 259; keeps secret a pap Breve, *ibid.*; is condemned, 270; a the Plot, 306, note; and the Oat 354; is removed from his office, 356.
Blount, Fr: and the "Holy Straw," 32 and Lord William Howard, 360; fi Provincial, 402; and Panzani, 425, 42
Bluet, Mr.: 258; and Bancroft, *ibid* and Blackwell, 259; and Elizabet *ibid.*; and the Pope, calumni against, 263.
Boderie, De la: on the Plot, 306, note
Bold, or Bolt, Mr.: 161.
Book of Miracles, The: 157.
Book of Resolutions, The: 92.
Book of the Succession, A: 125, 12 and Parliament, 150, note; and Charl I., *ibid.*; and James II., *ibid.*; an a of direct disobedience, 151, 178, 17 and Dr. Giffard, 181; a drum, 18 results of, 426; parts reprinted Parliament, 427.
Borghese, The: and the Envoys, 24 250, 251; and Parsons, 270.
Borromeo, St. Charles: helps the trav lers, 49; writes to Agazzari, 49.
Breda, Treaty of: 436.
Brett, Arthur: appointed Agent Rome, 426.
Britannia, The Breve: 413; surreptitio 414.

romley, Sir Henry: sent to Hinlip, 307; takes Garnett, 309; on to London, 310.
rooks, Sir Basil: and the Jesuits' soap, 414; and bishops, 423.
uckhurst, Lord: and Parsons, 24, 25.
urghley, Lord: letter to, 231.
urnet, Bishop: quoted, 12.
ye Plot: 284.
yrd, Dr. William: 161.

abel, Roland: 91.
ajetan, Cardinal: staunch friend of the Jesuits, 213; arranges with Parsons, *ibid*; letter to the Clergy, 244; and the Envoys, 248, 250, 251.
amberwell, Jesuit house at: 405.
ampion, Fr. Edmund: a true hero, 13; a type, *ibid.*; his influence over Parsons, 20; on the side of Conscience, 21; in Bohemia, 31; writes to Parsons, 32; starts for England, 47; on the journey, 48; arrives at Rheims, 51; arrives in London, 55; writes his *Declaration*, 58; it is published, 66; is no traitor, *ibid.*; his *Ten Reasons*, 68; addresses the Queen, 75; at Lyford, 78; taken prisoner, 80; before the Queen, 80; tortured, 81, note; holds disputations, *ibid.*; his trial, 82; death and character, 83; his relics, 159, 160, 388.
anterbury, the Archbishop of: is scandalised, 413, 415.
aramuel: on calumny, 103.
aryll, Mr.: 444.
asaubon, Isaac: 320, note.
assinese Congregation, The: 333.
astlemain, Earl of: 444.
asuistry, A case of: 289; and direction, 463; and Vitelleschi, *ibid.* note.
atesby, Robert: and Garnett, 277; his case, 289; sounds Garnett, 289; confers with Garnett, 290; satisfies the conspirators, *ibid.*; is admonished by Garnett, 292; unwilling for the Pope to be informed, *ibid.*; is willing to tell Garnett, 294; joins Garnett at Coughton, 301.
atherine of Braganza: and the Jesuits, 434.
atholic Peers: and the Oath, 356.
atholics: at Anglican services, 57; increase of, 75; and heretics, 274; under persecution, 360, 361; new laws against, 442.
ecil, John: his information, 142, 143, 144 and note; joins the Envoys, 260; Parsons' report on, 263; and the Jesuits, 285; and Champney, 366.
Centralisation: effects of, 10; and the Jesuits, *ibid.*; policy of, 171.
Challoner, Bishop: and the Society, 470.
Chambers, George: 308.
Champney, A.: one of the Envoys, 259; Parsons on, 264; and Cecil, 366.
Chapter, Institution of the: 412, 431.
Charles I.: misinformed by the Jesuits, 413; and Reunion, 415; demands the withdrawal of the Jesuits from England, 426, note.
Charles II.: restoration, 433; and Reunion, 434; opens negotiations with Rome, 435; his correspondence with the Jesuit General, *ibid.*; professes his faith, *ibid.*; his bastard becomes a Jesuit, 436; gives money to the Society, *ibid.*; his religious policy, 436, 437, 438; and the Triple Alliance, 437; and Louis XIV., 437, 438; and Oates' Plot, 439, 440, 441, 442; and the Jesuits, 441; his remorse, 443; his death, 443.
Charnock, Robert: 245; letter from, 246, 250, 258.
Chisholm, Bishop: 225, note.
Christendom: shaken, 1; distracted, 2.
Church, The: the nature of, 2; not above the Pope, 3; attempted to be worked by the Society, 10; the government of, 247.
Cisneros, Abbat: and the *Spiritual Exercises*, 27.
Clement VII., Pope: 8.
Clement VIII., Pope: and the Society, 152, 332, note; sends Breves to England, 274; his proposal to James, 279; weeps over James' book, 283; offers to withdraw Jesuits from England, 285; exiles Parsons from Rome, 346, 435.
Clement XIV., Pope: a great Pontiff, 472; his *Breve* suppressing the Society, *ibid.*; libel on, by Thorpe, 473.
Clenock, Dr. Maurice: 35; his government, 41.
Clergy, The: and the Jesuits, 67; principles at stake, 171; stand for Personality and Conscience, 172; the Association, 211, 212; and learning, 217; to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, 217; accused of schism, 255; called by Garnett "these fellows," 257; their loyalty recognised by Elizabeth, 258; calumniated by the Jesuits, 398; and Douai, 399; their case in a nutshell, 401; and the Spanish match, 406, 407; learn in the school of affliction, 415; are reconciled with the Regulars, 418, 424, 425; deprived of Lime Street Chapel by the

Jesuits, 446; accused of Jansenism, *ibid.* note; and bishops, 447.
Clerkenwell: Jesuit home at, 404; forged letter of, 405, 406.
Clifford, Lord: 437.
Clifton, Fr.: and the Earl of Derby, 428, etc.
Cloche, De la: a royal bastard, 435; becomes a Jesuit, *ibid.*; visits his father, 436.
Coffin, Fr.: letter of, 361.
Coke, Sir Edward: and Garnett, 317.
Coleman, Secretary: and Père la Chaise, 437, note.
Colleton, John: founds the Association, 211; threatened by Blackwell, 256; is suspended, 257; his *Just Defence of the Slandered Priests*, 260.
Commission, The Ecclesiastical: 459.
Como, The Cardinal of: 66.
Coniers, Fr.: governs at Douai, 239, 241; extraordinary conduct of, 400.
Conn: appointed papal agent, 429.
Conscience: manifestation of, among Jesuits, 29.
Conspiracies, The: against Elizabeth's life, 105.
Conspirators, The: their Oath, 286.
Constable, Fr.: and Dodd, 470.
Constance, Council of: 3.
Contzen, Adam: methods of making converts, 431, 432.
Cooper, Anthony Ashley: 438, 439.
Copie of a letter of Mr. Dr. Allen, A: a shameful defence, 121; suspected to be by another hand, *ibid.*
Corbie, Fr.: executed, 428.
Cornwallis, Sir Charles: 331.
Corporation Act, The: 437.
Council of Basle: 3.
Council of Constance: 3.
Council of Pisa: 2.
Council of Reformation, The: 153, 154.
Council of Trent: and Rome, 7; opposition to, *ibid.*; and Reform, *ibid.*; and the Jesuits, 10.
Courtney, Fr.: in prison, 415; gives in, *ibid.*; and Catherine of Braganza, 434.
Coutinho, Don Pedro de: 343.
Creighton, Fr.: arrives in England, 71; makes rash promises, 94; absurdities of, 96; his false statements about Scotland, *ibid.*; goes to Rome, 97; quarrels with Parsons, 126; withstands him, *ibid.*; heard the Scotch are tricked by Parsons, *ibid.* note; is furious with Parsons, 183; correspondence with, 184–188; is to be removed, 194; his opposition allowed by Aquaviva, 458.
Creswell, Fr.: at court, 134, note; hi "indiscreet and tyrannical behaviour, 177; gives little satisfaction in Spain 195; extraordinary view of, *ibid.*; an the Succession, 276; and the Plot, 33 note; champions the Jesuits of Alcal 332, note; and the students of Valla dolid, 341; and those of Douai, 398.
Cromwell, Oliver: and the Jesuits, 42 431.
Crosse, Captain: in the Inquisition, 13 note.
Curia, The: its temporal pretensions, 2 its rapacity, *ibid.*; opposed to a reform, 3; and Spanish system, 9 compromises the Mission, 52.

Darbishire, Fr., 39; 234.
Davis, Dr.: 240 and note.
Declaration of the Gallican Church: an the Jesuits, 452.
Declaration of Indulgence: 438.
Declaration of Liberty of Conscience 459.
Del Bufalo: the Nuncio, 346.
Del Rio: and the seal of Confessio 398.
Denouncing, Mutual: effect of, 31, 451.
Deposition of Princes: and the Oath 352.
Derby, Earl of: and Fr. Clifton, 42 etc.
Devil-hunting: 158.
Devils: eccentric names of, 159.
Digby, Sir Everard: and the Plot, 28 300.
Direction: dangers of, 330.
Disloyalty: taught in Spanish semi aries, 137, 138.
Dispensing Power: 459.
D'Israeli: and Parsons' literary styl 475.
Dodd, Charles: his honesty vindicate 419; his works, 469.
Doleful Even-Song, The: 402; and th Government, 404.
Dominicans, The: and the Jesuits, 15 note, 342.
Dominus ac Redemptor Noster, Th Breve: 472, 474, note.
Douai: Benedictines at, 348, 349, 35 College founded, 34; disputes at, 39 398, 399; and the Clergy, *ibid.*; visit tion of, 400; and Jansenism, 46 etc.
Dover, Treaty of: 438.
Drury, Fr.: and the Doleful Even-Son 402.
Dryden: and the Jesuits, 448, note.

cclesiastical Commission, The: 459.
dmonton: Jesuit house at, 405.
lementary Schools: 9.
liot: the spy, 79.
lizabeth, Queen: the changes in religion, 13; her right to the throne, 20; and Philip II., *ibid.*; her proposed marriage, 68; and Campion, 80; conspiracy to kill, 105; aware of them, 108, note; her conversion not desired by the Jesuits, 115; plots against her life, 145; and the Appellants, 258; thanks the French Ambassador, 264; "the miserable woman," 275; her death, 280.
ly, Dr.: his *Certayne Briefe Notes*, 254; on the Envoys, *ibid.*; on the Jesuits, 255.
nds and Means: 8.
ngland: and the Renascence, 5; and St. Ignatius, 12; plan of reducing, 97; anti-Jesuit movement in, 171–177.
nglefield, Sir Francis: his last letter to Philip II., 189.
nglish Benedictines: and Greek, 5. *See also* Benedictines.
nglish Catholics: and the religious changes, 15; state of, 61; and Parsons, 231; dare to be independent, 236; commonsense of, 281; troubled, 315; and Jesuits, 452.
nglish Exiles: their treatment, 108; Feria's letter on, 193.
nglish Government, The: position of, 65.
nglish Jesuits, The: and Spanish seminaries, 133. *See also* Jesuits, Parsons, *and* The Society.
nglishmen: and the Society, 12, 13.
nglish Prior, The: 115.
nglish Province, The: numbers in, 436.
nglish Seminary at Rome: 34, 35; disturbances at, *ibid.*; cause of the disturbances, 26; refractory helped by the Jesuits, *ibid.*; secured by the Jesuits, *ibid.*; students revolt against the Jesuits, 40; another outbreak, 112; again in rebellion, 177; system of spying, *ibid.*; students denounce Fr. Harewood to the Pope, *ibid.*; visitation, 178; Cardinal Toledo sides with the students, *ibid.*; dies soon after, *ibid.*; students loyal subjects, *ibid.*; students hate Parsons and Spaniards, 179; students confer with Parsons, 200; bad state of, 242.
voys, The Two: 245; go to Rome, 247; fall into Parsons' hands, 248; imprisoned by Parsons, 249; their treatment, *ibid.*; examined, 250; dismissed, 252; verdict of posterity on, 254.
Envoys, The Four: set out, 259, protected by the French King, 260; arrived in Rome, *ibid.*; kept clear of Parsons, *ibid.*; before the Pope, 261; cleared of schism, *ibid.*
Episcopacy: extraordinary ideas on, 420, 422.
Equivocation: and Parsons, 144; the weapon of the weak, 310, note; settles Garnett's fate, 319; and the law, 326; Mr. Jardine on, *ibid.*; Dr. S. R. Gardiner on, *ibid.*; what it is, *ibid.*; no invention of Garnett, 327; his book on, *ibid.*; *The Month* on, *ibid.*; Newman on, 328.
Escobar: and equivocation, 103.
Established Church, The: and the Jesuits, 459.
Este, Maria d': 436.
Eu: the school at, 94.
Eugenius, Pope: 2.
Eusebius: letter of, 77.
Exorcisms: strange methods of, 158, 159; alarm the more prudent, *ibid.*, 160.
Experimenta; the six, 29.

Farnese, Cardinal: 117.
Fate of historians, The usual: 419, note.
Fawkes, Guy: and Fr. Baldwin, 282; favours the Jesuits, 283.
Fecknam, Abbat: his gentle spirit, 174.
Fenwick, Fr.: and the Oates Plot, 440, 442.
Feria, Duke of: letter on the English Exiles, 193.
Fisher: his memorial, 226, 227; his fate, 231.
Fitzherbert, Thomas: and Parsons, 347; his ally, 371; removed from his agency, 381, note.
Flanders: English exiles in, 108; anti-Jesuit movement in, 180.
Floyd, Fr.: writes against bishops, 419.
Floyd, Griffith: 329.
Foley, Br.: nothing if not eulogistic, 161; his mistake, 258; untrustworthiness, 313, note; on Garnett, 330, note.
Forged Letter, A: 405, etc.
Fosnet, Dr.: at Milan, 239.
Fouljeam, Godfrey: and Fr. Holt, 337.
Foundation of Jesuits: 7.
France, King of: urges patience, 353.
Francis Borgia, St.: on ambition, 11.
Francis, Dom Alban: 458, 459.
French Jesuits: condemn their English brethren, 426.

Gallican model: for English Church, 435.
Gardiner, Dr. S. R.: 286; his masterly book, 287.
Garnett, Fr. Henry: 13, 31; is Superior, 162; protects his subjects, 163; commendation of Bagshawe, 177; shares in treasonable practices, 191; sends rules of the Association to Parsons, 212; his letter to the Clergy, 226, 227; defends the Archpriest, 246; supports charge of schism, 255; domineering letter from, 256; on the malcontents, *ibid.*; and the Clergy, 257; "these fellows," *ibid.*; his faculties, 272; shows the Breves, 275; and the poor Catholics, 278; he "mislikes" it, *ibid.*; docile to Parsons, 279; on the accession, 280; his counsel, *ibid.*; his aliases, *ibid.* note; writes to Creswell, 282; tries to bribe Cecil, 285; his fears, 288; his suspicions, *ibid.*; but says he was unsuspicious, 289; knows by mere chance, *ibid.*; writes to Parsons, *ibid.*; is sounded by Catesby, *ibid.*; gravely to be censured, 290; is called a "sheep," *ibid.*; muses, *ibid.*; questions Catesby, *ibid.*; knows something is intended, 291; did he warn the General? *ibid.*; he protects himself, *ibid.*; admonishes Catesby, 292; "propounds" Baynham, *ibid.*; is evidently alarmed, 293, 298, 300, 301; writes to the General, 293; and Greenway, 294; itches to know, 295; resolves Greenway's conscience, *ibid.*; learns details from him, *ibid.*; no confession made, 296; inconsistent about sacramental seal, 297; fears the galleys, 298; is to be pitied, *ibid.*; letter to Parsons, 299; deceives everyone, *ibid.*; withdraws from Catesby's company, *ibid.*; goes on a pilgrimage, *ibid.*; did he approve of the Plot? 300; visits conspirators, *ibid.*; goes to Coughton, *ibid.*; preaches there, 301; allows Greenway to join the conspirators, *ibid.*; hue and cry after, 302; goes with Anne Vaux to Hinlip, *ibid.*; his letter to the Council, 303; protests his innocency, 304; his love for James, 305; says matters of state are repugnant to the Society, *ibid.*; promises to pray for James, 306; the search for, 307; capture of, 309; on his hiding, 310; before the Council, *ibid.*; treatment in the Tower, 311; his advice to the other Jesuits, *ibid.*; letters from the Tower, 312; tricked, *ibid.*; confides in Oldcorne, *ibid.*, 313; confesses his treason with Spain, *ibid.*; is overheard, *ibid.*; before the Council, *ibid.*; confesses, 314; his trial, 315; admits his knowledge of the Plot, 316; found guilty of High Treason, *ibid.*; extenuation of his guilt, 317; efforts to make him recant, *ibid.*; a penitent thief, *ibid.*; avows his guilt, 318; denies that he dies a martyr, *ibid.*, 320; *In medio illusorum*, 319; his passionate exclamation, *ibid.*; visited by Anglican deans, 320; his reported conversion, 321; his execution and death, 322; the "Holy Straw," 322, etc.; his case and modern procedure, 325; his alias of Farmer, *ibid.* note; and Shakespeare, *ibid.*; his morals, 329, 330; no martyr, *ibid.*; high personal ideals, *ibid.*; and equivocation, 306–318, 325, 326, 327, 328; no reliance to be placed on his word, 319; his fate settled by Equivocation, *ibid.*; his character, by Foley, 161; as he was, 325; his personal description, 302; a little fat man, *ibid.*; his successor, 355.
Garnett, Fr. Thomas: his life, 357; and the Oath, 358; his trial, 359; his death, 360.
Gemnasco: and the Jesuits, 341.
General, The Jesuit: The living Rule, 8; absolute monarchy of, 10.
General Congregation, The: declaration of, 30; forbids politics, 151; and Aquaviva, 152.
"Gentleman, The Turbulent": his history, 466, etc.
Gentlemen from Liège, The: 473.
Gerard, Fr.: 162; successful with the Exercises, *ibid.*; a great money collector in consequence, *ibid.*; excused by Fr. Morris, *ibid.*; his romantic life, 163; in the Counter, 164; and the four leopards, *ibid.*; equivocates on loyalty, 165; in the Clink, *ibid.*; in prison manages for everyone, 166; tortured, *ibid.*, 167; escapes from the Tower, 168; and the conspirators, 286 and note; the value of his evidence, 297, note; his surmises, 314; poor defence of Garnett, *ibid.*; no trustworthy recorder, 321; his personal description, 302.
Gerard, Very Rev. John: a brilliant essay, 287.
Gerson: on the schism, 3.
Gervase, John: sees visions, 334.
Ghent: house at, 401; provincial meeting at, 443.
Giffard, Bonaventure: 458.
Giffard, Dr.: opposes the Jesuits, 181; denounces the *Book of Succession* to the Nuncio, *ibid.*; high character of, 194; is to be attacked, *ibid.*; and Parsons

218; a friend of the Nuncio, 220; oyal and honest, 226, note; letter to Parsons, 228, 229; letters from Parsons, *ibid.*; is willing to join Parsons in good works, 229; accused before the Nuncio, 230; failure of attack on, *ibid.*; his nission to James, 285; is removed rom Lille, 349.
lbert, George: converted, 33; returns o England, 44; leaves England, 74; lies in Rome, 107.
dfrey, Sir Edmundbury: 440; is killed, 441, 442.
lden Day, The: 444; another, 463.
lden Opportunity, A: 474.
ldwell, Bishop: 43; returns to Rome, 52.
od, Fr.: 26.
Goodly Credulity": 160.
rres: on the Reformation, 6.
ssip: the results of, 295, 296.
vernment, The: and the Jesuits, 64, 302.
eat Purification, The: 385.
eat Schism, The: 1.
eek Emperor: at Canterbury, 5.
eenway, Fr.: and Winter, 278; asserts on his salvation, 294, 295, note; confers with Garnett, *ibid.*; does not confess, 296; his secret, a natural one only, 297; and the conspirators, 301; escapes arrest, 302; description of, *ibid.*
egory XI., Pope: 1.
egory XIII., Pope: 29; befriends Douai, 34; blesses Jesuit Mission, 47; dies, 112.
egory XV., Pope: 410.
ffin, Hugh: his confession, 322; his wife, 324.
ise, Duke of: 94, 96.
npowder Plot, The: 285; arranged, 286; and the Jesuits, 330; and Parsons, 331; and Creswell, *ibid.* note.

ddock, Dr.: on Allen's death, 128, note; to be made Archbishop of Dublin, 191, 242, 251, 262.
rewood, Fr.: shameful accusations of, 177.
rrison, Fr.: execution of, 428.
rrison, William: 428.
rsnett, Dr.: book against Weston, 158.
stings, Sir Francis: and Parsons, 345.
yhoe, Fr.: 116.
ighnison: 123.
nri IV.: 9.
retical Princes: and allegiance, 149.
retics: how to be dealt with, 480.
rnandez, Fr. James: 130.
"Hewers of wood and drawers of water": 72.
Heywood, Fr.: arrives in England, 71; troublesome reports about, 104; as Superior, 155; his baron-like state, 156; causes much scandal, *ibid.*; holds a meeting in Norfolk, *ibid.*; abolishes fasts and "uses," *ibid.*; reckons without his host, 157; his recall demanded, *ibid.*; captured and imprisoned, 107.
Heywood, John: 13, 14; sends Parsons to school, 16.
High doctrines of Jesuits: 327.
Hind and the Panther, The: 448, note.
Hinlip Castle: 306.
Holland, Fr.: executed, 426.
Holt, Fr.: 39, 71; supports Parsons, 96; rector at Rome, 129; letter to, 134, note; on the subjugation of the Clergy, 173; his harsh and tyrannical behaviour, 180; indignation against, 182; Parsons' opinion of, *ibid.*; to be supported, however, 194; defended by Parsons, 207; to remain in Flanders, 209; his credit there, 231; and Godfrey Fouljeam, 337. *See also* Parsons *and* Anti-Jesuit movement in Flanders.
Holtby, Fr.: his letter, 255; Garnett's successor, 355.
"Holy Hand," The: 410.
"Honest William": 439, 442.
House of Stuart, Ruin of: 447.
Howard, Cardinal: opposed by the Jesuits, 449; and Petre's Oath, 452, note.
Howard, Lord William: 360.
Hungerford, Fr.: 240.
Hunter, Fr.: his *Modest Defence of the Clergy and Religious*, 469.

Idiaquez, Secretary: letter to, 139.
Ignatius of Loyola, St.: founds the Society, 7; his aim, *ibid.*; and absolutism, *ibid.*; a Spaniard, 8; and Pole, 12; and England, 12; military instincts of, 31; on almsgiving, 162; true spirit of, 474.
Ignorance and Superstition: 5.
Imperium in Imperio: 9.
"Indiscrete Blabs": 465.
Indulgence, Declaration of: 438.
Infanta, The: as claimant to English Crown, 123.
Infusion not Education: 11.
Inner Circle of the Society, The: 31, 127.
Innocent III., Pope: 34.
Innocent XI., Pope: unfriendly to the Society, 448, 450; and Petre, 448; and his advancement, 449, etc.; his

conscience against Petre, *ibid.*; displeases the Jesuits, 451.
Innocent XII., Pope: and accusation of Jansenism, 464.
Inquisition, The: and the Society, 130; to be introduced into England, 154; "under another name," 445.
Instructions for the Mission: 45.
Intellect and Will: abnegation of, 30.
Ireland: a Catholic Parliament in, 456.
Ireland, Fr.: and the Oates Plot, 440, 442.
Irish College: 135.
Italian diplomacy: 52.

James I.: conversion desired by Scotch Catholics, 116; writes to the Pope, 274; and the Jesuits, 279; and the Catholics, *ibid.*; succeeds, 280; and Parsons, 284; and Clement VIII., 285; his *Apologie*, 354.
James II.: his conversion, 436; succeeds, 443; and the Jesuits, 444; and the Pope, *ibid.*; and the dispensing power, *ibid.*; deceives the Clergy, 447; and the Catholics, *ibid.* note; his policy and Parsons' *Memorial*, 445; completely governed by the Jesuits, 449; and the Embassy to Rome, *ibid.*; his correspondence with the Pope, *ibid.*; his Franciscan confessor opposes the Jesuits, 450; deprived of him, *ibid.*; a Jesuit confessor supplied, *ibid.*; is angry with the Pope, 451; "bewitched" about Petre, 453; extravagant behaviour, 453; "a son of the Society," 454; his Parliamentary plans, 456; and his army, 457; and converts, *ibid.*; is not appreciated at Rome, 458; his *Declaration of Liberty of Conscience*, 459; his great blunder, *ibid.*; his fate, 460; his ruin brought about by Parsons' books, 461.
Jansenism: origin of, 463; charge of, 446; and the Jesuits, 463; reckless charges of, 464.
Jardine, Mr.: on Garnett's guilt, 316, 326.
"Jebusites": origin of the name, 64, note.
Jesuits, The: *See also* Society, The—circumstances attending the foundation, 4; foundation, 7; and Paul III., *ibid.*; their work, 9; and seminaries, 10; in Spain, 12; numbers of, 31; at English seminary in Rome, 35; help refractory students, 36; secure the seminary, *ibid.*; advantages of, 37; call in Allen's help, 40; Mission to England, 44; instructions for, 45; forbidden to meddle in politics, 46; known to the Government, 47; start, *ibid.*; the journey, 48; arrival in England, 53; suspected by the Marian Clergy, 55; and politics, 56; proposed closing of the Mission, *ibid.*; introduce new customs, 57; cause a persecution, 67; proclamation against, 70; Campion taken, 80; Parsons driven out, 84; Heywood, 155, etc.; Mission opposed by French Provincial, 110; oppose toleration, 235; their reasons, 236; propose to purchase toleration, 360; *Modus vivendi*, 361, etc.; Fr. More on the Mission, 388; strengthen their position, 401; Jesuit houses, *ibid.*, 402; number of English Jesuits, 401; made a Vice-Province, *ibid.*; made a Province, *ibid.*; expenditure of, 405; few of them prisoners, 418; their soap, 414; and trading instinct, *ibid.* note; opposed to Reunion, 421, 422; prudent custom of, 423, note; wealth of, 430; excluded from proposed toleration, 433; their plea against, *ibid.*; proposed English General, 434; numbers of, 436; in London, 438; their Golden Day, 444; open schools, 445; are suppressed, 471; lose their houses, 472, 473; and Stonyhurst, *ibid.*, 474; numbers of, *ibid.*; restoration, *ibid.*; houses, *ibid.*; to a different world, *ibid.*
Their Political Doings: *See also* Parsons, Garnett, *and* Petre—in Scotland, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93; considered untrustworthy, 94, note; Mary's opinion of them, 95; and the meeting in Paris, 96; Jesuits in Poland, 154; and Henri IV., 233, note; their settled hope, 235; instructed to be more wary, 269; plot against James I., 277, 281; their excuses to him, 282; and forcible enterprises, 289; and the Government, 302; proclaimed, *ibid.*; and the Gunpowder Plot, 330; intrigues, 343; stir the Pope against James I., 353; and the Oath, 356, 433, 434; and Catholic Peers, 356; and the Spanish match, 406, 407; support Oliver Cromwell, 427, 428; oppose the Nuncio in Ireland, *ibid.*; and the Deposing Power, 433; and Catherine of Braganza, 434; and the Oates Plot, 440; with a King of their own, 443; Parsons' *Memorial* produced, 445; at the Savoy, 445, 446; bask in the royal favour, 446; ruin of the

House of Stuart, 447; the *primo mobile* of the Government, 448; completely govern James I., 449; advise a schism, 451; rush on to ruin, 452; and the laity, *ibid.*; and royalty, 453, 454; at Oxford, 455; college at the Savoy, 456; a Jesuit confessor supplied, 458; their diplomacy, *ibid.*; and the Universities, *ibid.*, 459; and the Established Church, *ibid.*; and Trinity College Dublin, *ibid.*; their superiors alone to blame, 460; they were the ambitious men, *ibid.*; responsible for all, *ibid.*; knew Petre, 461; their opportunity of statecraft, *ibid.*; the result, *ibid.*; and the Stuarts, 462; their work destroyed, *ibid.*; result of their politics, *ibid.*

And the Clergy: 10; and the Archpriest, 213, 215, 246, 366; aim at subjugating the Clergy, 172; keep the purse, 256; and the Appellants, 271; dejected at their success, 272; calumniate them, 398; meddle with them, 401; charge them with Jansenism, 446; turn them out of a chapel, *ibid.* and note; and the bishop, 411, 412, 416, 417; exasperated with Panzani, 422, 423, 424, 426; refuse to be reconciled, 425, 426; and Sega, 172; and students, 340; grasp at Lisbon, 344; and Douai, 397, 399, 400; to foreclose on Douai, 399; and Benedictines, 12; jealous of, 43, 339; dislike of, 350, note; at the Savoy, 445; at St. Edmundsbury, 446 and note; and monastic property, 153; and Dominicans, 150; and Jansenism, 463; and Pascal, *ibid.*; their mistake, *ibid.*; accusations of Jansenism, 464; accused the Clergy, 465; and Bishop Stonor, *ibid.*; and Douai College, 466; the "Turbulent Gentleman," *ibid.*, 467, 468; and Benedictines, *ibid.*; and vicars-apostolic, 470, 471.

Their Characteristics: and Puritanism, 8; Spanish characteristics, 9; true Latins, 10, 11; self-confidence, *ibid.*; and individuality, *ibid.*; their obedience, 7, 8, 30; are mendicant clerks, 29; simplicity of, 95; officiousness resented, 170; stand for authority, 171; not lovers of peace, 225, note, 255; "Our's," 289; and the Pope, 9; and the Council of Trent, 10; direct the Church, *ibid.*; apostles of the rich, 11; and royalty, 137, note, 435, 446; high doctrines, 327; and conscience, 12; dangerous casuistry, 103, 289; and toleration, 234; and laity, 329, 381, note; their ghostly children, 416; as educationalists, 9; their system, 11; General the Living Rule, 8; mere functionaries, *ibid.*; and missions, 9, note; and Mohammedan Sects, 9 note; absolute monarchy of General, 10; and centralisation, *ibid.*; their organisation, 11; system of mutual denunciation, 31; dislike of episcopal control, 8; and Presbyterianism, *ibid.*; Cardinal Manning and, *ibid.*; and Episcopacy, 420; and Innocent XI., 449, 450; attitude towards the Pope, 451; in France and the Nuncio, 452; and the Gallican Church, *ibid.*; wanted to play a part, 461; loved to act from the dark, *ibid.*; a victim of the system *ibid.*; their accusations and Innocent XII. 464; the "Turbulent Gentleman," 466, etc.; and Jansenist-hunting, 468; fight in the rear, 470; results of their education, 471; and the Suppression, 471, etc.; reasons for, 472; their golden opportunity, 474.

Jones, Dom Leander: 341.
Jones, Fr.: his paradox, 255.
Jones, Fr. Robert: tries to inveigle the Archpriest, 364; his letter, 365.
Jouvency, Fr.: does not know Parsons, 151, note.
Judgment of a Catholic Englishman, The: 386.

Kennet: *Register and Chronicle*, 433.
Keynes, Fr. A.: resolves doubts, 455.
Keynes, Fr.: and Petre, 450, 451, 460, 461.
Knott, Fr.: writes against bishops, 419.

La Chaise Père: 437, note; correspondence with Petre, 457.
Lainez: and bishops, 10; and Spanish Jesuits, 12.
Laity, The: and the yoke, 171.
Lamennais: on the Society, 8.

ciled, 73; nearly captured, *ibid.*; at Stonor Park, *ibid.*; distribution of books, 74; his flight and excuses, 85, 86, 87; intimate with Aquaviva, 86; at Rouen, 87; wanted in England, 88, 90, 91; and Scotland, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93; wants money, 90; gives Allen money, 91; establishes a school at Eu, 94; is ill, 96; to go to Spain, 97; sick at Bilbao, 102; thought to be dead, *ibid.*; returns to Paris, 104; goes to Rome, 106; nearly taken prisoner, 109; returns to Rouen, 110; is opposed by French Provincial, *ibid.*; his books do more harm than good, *ibid.*; so sends more into England, 111; asks for Garnett, *ibid.*; returns to Rome, 112; takes the Four Vows, 126, 127; rector at Rome, 129; starts for Spain, *ibid.*; sent to manage Philip II., 132; why remains in Spain, *ibid.*, 133; his successes, 133; founds seminary at Valladolid, 135; turns trader, 137; founds other seminaries, 138; realises something is amiss, *ibid.*; and the galley-slaves, 139; starts for Rome, 147; proclamation against, 148; "a schoolman," *ibid.*; at Madrid, 149; and the Cardinalate, 152, 181; and Fr. Holt, 194, 195; hopes to return to Spain, 196; letter to Manareus, 207; the Cardinalate again, 209; the story of the red flannel, *ibid.*; interviews the Pope, *ibid.*; on Fisher, 227; and Giffard, 228, 229; achieves his position, 231; is justified, 233; at his zenith, *ibid.*; his express messengers, 235, 237; his conduct of business, 236, 237; as Carteret, 241; his post and secretaries, 241, 242; how paid, 243; his coach and horses, 242; is Prefect of the Mission, 243, 368, 369; and Creswell, 341; as a match-maker, 346; is exiled by the Pope, *ibid.*; reasons, 347; regains favour, 378; *Answer to Cook*, 385; *A Treatise to Mitigation*, *ibid.*; his last illness, 386; last letter to his brethren, *ibid.*; death, 388; his surgeon, 389; his tomb, *ibid.*

The Plotter, 13; to Allen, 33, 40; to Campion, 32, 38; and England, 37; his *Memorial* begun, 38; consults with Allen, 42; his *aliases*, 48; denies any political intention, 56; begins intrigues, 62; a traitor, 65; and de Mendoza, 69; a tool, *ibid.*; joins the Spanish party, *ibid.*; drafts a book, *ibid.*; and Mary Queen of Scots, *ibid.* note; relations with Allen, 76; leads him into politics, 77; his party small, 78; insinuates at Cambridge, 80; declared a rebel, 93; his first state document, 98; books on the Armada, 98, 99; is Melino, 100, 106, note, 107 and note, 109, 114, 116, 118; on Allen, 98; says he is general spokesman, 100; procures money for James, 102; and pension for Douai, *ibid.*; opposition to his plans, 104; the quarrel with Paget and Morgan, 104; his opponents loyal, 105; his party conspire to kill Elizabeth, *ibid.*; tries to gain over Paget, 106; misleads the Pope, 109; heart and soul with Spain, 110; goes to Rome, 112; is a Spanish decoy-bird, 113; writes *An Admonition* and *A Declaration*, 114; understands partly Spanish projects, 115; deceives the Pope and English Catholics, *ibid.*; is himself duped, *ibid.*; and Sir William Stanley, 120; and *The Copie of a Letter*, *ibid.*; and the Succession, 122; reasons for an Armada, 123; political education now complete, 124; deceives Philip, *ibid.*; his behaviour on Mary's death, 125; deliberate deception on, *ibid.*; the defeat of the Armada, 128; letter to Idiaquez, 139; on the Armada, 140; acknowledges he has no party in England, *ibid.*; on England under Spain, 141; claims a party in England, 143; gapes after martyrs, *ibid.*; instructs Cecil to deceive Spaniards and English, 144; stirs up Philip, 145; the only man to be feared, *ibid.*; his share in plots against Elizabeth, *ibid.*; Laton's charge, 146; "not proven," 148; *Andreas Philopatrum*, *ibid.*; not the King's confessor, *ibid.*; on papal temporal claims, *ibid.*; justifies his rebellion, 149; entirely rejects James, *ibid.*; his grand effort, *ibid.*; on the Succession, 150; democratic doctrine, *ibid.*, 476, 477; and Creighton, 184, etc.; dispute with Creighton allowed by Aquaviva, 458; his policy attacked on all sides, 188; urges Philip to deception, 190; another Armada, *ibid.*; avows Garnett's complicity, 191; and the English exiles, *ibid.*; sends men, *ibid.*; at Barcelona, 193; temporises about Holt, 195, 197; at Genoa, 197; at

Rome, 198; defends Holt, 207; and Paget, 218; and Giffard, *ibid.*; letter to Idiaquez, 219, etc.; and his opponents, 222; writes to Paget, 223; willingly deceived, 227; his spies, 237, etc.; corresponds with the Government, 271; supreme hour of his policy, 275; sends Breves to Garnett, *ibid.*; secures and instructs the Nuncio, *ibid.*; and Philip III., 276; deceives Possevino, 279; and the accession, 280, note; flatters James, 283; the only man, 289; letter to, *ibid.*, 299; wants to know of plots, 300; and Garnett, 331; and Gunpowder Plot, *ibid.*; on the Oath, 354; *The Judgment of a Catholic Englishman*, 386; *A Quiet, Sober Reckoning*, *ibid.*; his *Memorial* and Petre, 458; his books destroy the Stuart cause, 461.

Takes the side of refractory students, 37; on the disputes, 40; proposes an Archpriest, 43; secures the lead, 48; and the Clergy, 67, 481, etc.; acts as superior, *ibid.*; on the need of a bishop, 68; practically Superior, 71; plots against Allen, 72; and the Clergy, 84; and Allen's Cardinalate, 102, 113; suggests him as Archbishop of Canterbury, 122; at the seminaries, 147; *Memorial for the Reformation*, 153; and monastic property, *ibid.*, 481, 482, 483; and Wisbeach broils, 175; and Church property, 190; suggests Worthington as bishop, 191; Haddock as Archbishop of Dublin, *ibid.*; and seminarists at Valladolid, 192; at Rome, 199; holds conferences, 200; his arguments, 202; wins golden opinions, *ibid.*; his better feelings, 203; letter to Holt, *ibid.*; and bishops for England, 210, 487, 488; his scheme, 211; deceives the Pope, 213; institutes an Archpriest, 214; underestimates the Clergy, *ibid.*; and degrees, 216, 217; influence on Worthington, *ibid.*; and the envoys, 247, 248; imprisons them, 249; overhauls their luggage, 250; increase of credit, 252; his account of the envoys, 253; and the charge of schism, 255; *A Briefe Apologie*, 259; instructions, 268; and the Archpriest, 269; disappointed with the result, 270, note; and monopoly, 332; his credit failing, *ibid.*; fights against the Benedictines, 333; his methods, 349; tries to reassert himself, 364; his old tactics, 367; and Birkhead, 370, etc.; his puppet, 371; protests he meddles not, 372; deceives Birkhead, 374, 376; and Smith, 378, 379; defends himself, 382, etc.; protests, 385; last letter to Clergy, 387; his *Memorial*, 432, 444, 445; his injury to the two envoys repaired, 472.

The greatest of English Jesuits, 13; his spirit lasting, *ibid.*; his religious doubts, 21; and Puritanism, *ibid.*; the Elect, 22; makes the Spiritual Exercises, 27; attracted to the Society, 28; becomes a Jesuit, 29; his unwearied charity, 33; volunteers for Indian Mission, 37; his active brain, 38; his character then, 44; takes the lead, 57, 58; and the Puritanical spirit, 62; is disobedient, *ibid.*; his presence of mind, 63; under a delusion, 71; diverts the alms, 74; as a director, 75; and his superiors, 87; manages his General, 91; gives a false impression, 98; his magnetic personality, 102; and Spanish theology, 103; his Puritanism, 109, 241; indiscreet, 113; the supplanter, 114; writes what is convenient, 116; the only manager, 126; his vain dreams, 129; resignation, 142; and Equivocation, 144, 495; dupes Henry Walpole, 147; does not follow his own advice, *ibid.*; "that most religious man," *ibid.*; defines the faith, 148, 149; his only ambition, 153; suppresses parts of letters, 179; denies authorship of *Book of the Succession*, 181, 200; the "Lantern of the Country," 182; his little list, 199; as a peacemaker, 200; flatters vanity, 202; triumphs, *ibid.*; sees the fault at Rome, 204; excellent sentiments, 205; corrects draft of letters in his favour, 206; love of the great, *ibid.*; interpolates, *ibid.*; an untrustworthy witness, *ibid.*; and Presbyterian ideal, 212; to be judged by his own dictum, 217; and his friends, 233; the one hope, *ibid.*; his credit with the Pope, 234; his day-dreams, 237; his grim humour, *ibid.*; diverts money from the seminaries, *ibid.* and note; his

style, 253, note; his common practice, *ibid.*; his tender conscience, 260; found out, 261; his untruths, 262; his memorials, 263, note; his letter, 264; moralises, 265; gibes against Mush, 268; his duplicity, *ibid.*; his standpoint, 269; his "diabolic spirit," 270; and the prohibition, 270, 271; and toleration, 275, note; his double game, 277; his turn of mind, 280; declares Jesuits only pray, *ibid.*; is exceedingly comforted by James's book, 283; a wonderful man, 345; praises himself anonymously, 346; his works, 347; his extraordinary reasons, 355; suppresses documents, 356, 371, note; forgetfulness of facts, 367; more untruths, 373, 376, 377, note, 379, note, 383, note, 384; an untrustworthy witness, 374; exceeding jealous, 381, note; holds himself blameless, 384; care for his soul, 385; confirmed in Puritanism, *ibid.*; sure of Election, 388; his epitaph, 389; his character, by More, 391; by Constable, 393; by Oliver, *ibid.*; by Tanner, *ibid.*; by *The Month*, *ibid.*, 394; by himself, *ibid.*; by the Author, 395; his spirit contemned, 474; "a prince of controversialists," 475; his literary power, *ibid.*; D'Israeli on, *ibid.*; Swift's opinion of, 476; his works, *ibid.*, etc.

Pascal, Blaise: the Provincial Letters, 463; helped by the Jesuits, *ibid.*

Pasquin on Parsons: 346.

Paul III., Pope: and the Society, 7.

Paul IV., Pope: his temporal pretensions, 20.

Paul V., Pope: recalls Parsons, 348; the Borghese, 353; condemns Oath, 355; on Parsons, 397.

Peace of stagnation, A: 471.

Peers, The Catholic: remonstrate with James II., 454.

Perkins, Sir Christopher: an ex-Jesuit, 351.

Perne, Dean: 18, note.

Petre, Fr.: and English history, 13; Clerk of the Closet, 444; called "Your Eminence," 447, 454; all-powerful, *ibid.*; deceived by Sunderland, *ibid.*; Macaulay on, *ibid.*; and the Catholics, *ibid.*; and the Archbishopric of York, 448; and Dryden, 448, note; as a martin, *ibid.*; his advancement and Innocent XI., 449, etc.; a mitre or a hat? 450; is ordered from Rome to keep his vow, *ibid.*, 451; remains simple Jesuit, *ibid.*; made a Privy Councillor, 452; and takes the Oath *ibid.*; is "chiefly beloved," 454; corresponds with La Chaise, 457; and Parsons' *Memorial*, 458; and the seven bishops, 459; his indecent remarks *ibid.*; a *Tu quoque*, 460, is not appointed guardian, *ibid.* note; his only sensible advice, *ibid.*; escapes to the Continent, *ibid.*; is a scapegoat for others, *ibid.*; his superiors really to blame, *ibid.*; thoroughly well known to them, 461; a puppet for them to work, *ibid.*; more to be pitied than blamed *ibid.*; a victim to a system, *ibid.*

Philip II.: *See also* Spain—surprised at Elizabeth's excommunication, 19; and the English Catholics, 71; and Allen, 72; sends money, 93, 102; and the Babington Plot, 108, note; and England, 111; and the Pope, 112; his aim, 113; dupes Parsons, 114; decides authorship of books, *ibid.*; protests for invasion, 118; his Lancastrian succession, 122, note; cannot understand the Jesuits, 130; dislikes Aquaviva, *ibid.*; and religious orders, 131; cajoles seminarists, 134, note; yields to Parsons, 145; stirred up by, *ibid.*; sworn to be revenged, *ibid.*; urged by Parsons to deceive, 190.

Pickering, Br. Luke: 440, 442.

Pigott, Fr.: and the "Turbulent Gentleman," 466, etc.

Pisa, Council of: 2.

Pius V., Pope: and his Bull, 13; excommunicates Elizabeth, 19; explanation of, 46.

Pius VII., Pope: restores the Society, 474.

Plantata, The Bull: 414.

Plowden, Fr. Charles: and Panzani, 419.

Poland: under the Jesuits, 154.

Pole, Cardinal: and St. Ignatius, 12.

Politicorum Libri Decem: 431, 432.

Pope, The: *See also under different names*—centre of unity, 1; true position endangered, 2; not above the Church, 3; often puppets of factions, 4; the only plank, 8; and the Society, 12; declared enemy of Elizabeth, 65; to provide money, 101; and King of Spain, 261; 262; chaplain to him, 273; writes to Nuncio, 275; and Gunpowder Plot, 306, note; his spiritual power and the Oath, 352.

Popham, Chief Justice: and Garnett, 311.

Portuguese Jesuits, The: in rebellion, 30.

Possession: what is to be thought of, 160.

Possevino, Fr.: letter to, 279.

ounde, Thomas: 54; and Campion, 58, 65; challenges Puritans, *ibid.*
resbyterianism: and Jesuits, 8.
riests, The: to be "hispaniolated," 134; banished, 286.
rimrose Hill: 441.
Prince of Controversialists," A: 475.
rinces, Temporal: and the Oath, 352.
rivy Council, The: and Oates, 440.
ublic Opinion: and Fr. Petre, 447.
uritans, The: and Jesuits, 8; at Oxford, 18, 20; and Parsons, 241; persecuted, 436, 437.

uadra, Bishop: on Oxford, 18.
uiet, Sober Reckoning, A: 386.
uivoga, Cardinal: and Sixtus v.

ecusants, The: 66.
ediate, Fr.: 403.
eformation, The: needed, 2; real meaning of, 6; Görres on, *ibid.*
egicide: and the Oath, 352.
elacion de Algunos Martyrios: 143, note.
eligious Changes, The: effects of, 15.
enascence, The: 5; and Christianity, *ibid.*; and England, *ibid.*; and Rome, 6.
eply to Fr. Parsons' Libel, A: 132.
eply unto a certain Libel, A: 335.
eport of the Spanish Council, A: 276.
epression, Undue: its effects, 8.
equesens, Luis di: 26.
'Respectful Silence, A": 467.
eunion, Prospects of: 415; and Charles I., *ibid.*; and Laud, *ibid.*; and Charles II., 434.
icci, Fr.: his spirit, 12; saying of, 471; imprisoned, 472.
inuccini: opposed by Jesuits, 427, 428.
ishton, Edward: 345.
ivers, Fr.: reports to Parsons, 271, 272; laments the Pope's indulgence, *ibid.*
oberts, Fr.: expostulates with Panzani, 421; his untruth, *ibid.*
oberts, Dom John: and the Jesuits, 338, etc.
ome: and the Renascence, 6; and Spain, 8; English hospital at, 34; seminary, *ibid.*, 35; *see also under* English Seminary; to find money, 285; and Garnett, 330; methods of Procedure, 376, 377; grants a bishop at last, 411.
ossetti, Count: 426.
ues, Fr.: threatened with prison, 341.
unning Register, The: 330.

Sabran, Fr.: 465; and the "Turbulent Gentleman," 466, etc.
Samerie, Fr.: disguised with Queen of Scots, 219.
San Benito, The Abbat of: and the Jesuits, 338, 339, 341.
Sanders, Dr.: mission to Ireland, 51; to be made Cardinal, 72; his *De Schismate Anglicana*, 345.
Sapone Papistico, Il: 414.
Scotch Catholics, The: desire conversion of James, 115, 116.
Scotland and the Jesuits: 87, etc.
Scroggs, Chief Justice: 442.
Seal of Confession, The: 296; opinions on, 298.
Secret Policy of the Jansenists, The: 464.
Secret Policy of the Jesuits, The: Dodd's work, 464, note, 469.
Sega, Cardinal: extravagant praise, 170; report of, 178.
Selling, Dom William: goes to Italy, 5; introduces Greek at Canterbury, *ibid.*
Seminaries, The: a Jesuit device, 10; in place of monasteries, 12; foundation of, 34; opposed by English Catholics, 75; number of priests in England, 111; in Spain, 133; objects of, *ibid.*; priests as soldiers of Philip, *ibid.*; priests made much of at court, 134, note; device of, seen through, *ibid.*; at Valladolid, 135; benefactors to, 136; at Seville, 138; proposed dissolution of, 143; political object of, 147, note; Sega's report on, 178; exodus from, 333.
Seven Bishops, The: 459.
Seville: seminary at, 138.
Shakespeare: and Garnett, 325.
Shepherd, John: 34.
Sherlock, Anthony: 309.
Simpson, Mr. R.: 15, 353, 354.
Singleton, Dr.: sent to Douai, 397; offers a mitre, 399; protected by Jesuits, 400.
Sixtus v., Pope: dislikes the Society, 112; and his confessor, *ibid.* note; deceived by Olivares, 113; won't part with money, *ibid.*; demurs about Allen's hat, 122; his weak side, 130 and note; and the Spanish Inquisition, *ibid.*; and Cardinal Quivoga, 131; means business, *ibid.*
Smith, Dr. R.: and Parsons, 374, etc.; accused of heresy, 380; bishop of Chalcedon, 412; and the Regulars, *ibid.*, 413; chased out of England by the Jesuits, *ibid.*; his death, *ibid.*, 431.

Society, The: *See also* Jesuits—foundation of, 7; and Absolutism, *ibid.*; De Lamennais on, 8; founded on Spanish ideals, 9; original aims of, *ibid.*; opposition to, *ibid.*; aims at reforming the Church, 10; success of, 11; departs from primitive ideas, 12; and the Pope, *ibid.*; and Englishmen, *ibid.*; and domestic conflicts, *ibid.*; attracts Parsons, 28; and Predestination, 31; its inner circle, *ibid.*; to rule in England, 38; and Spanish politics, 43; a rival to the King, 130; and the Spanish Inquisition, *ibid.*; its Constitutions imperilled, 131, 132; and Clement VIII., 152; and Cardinal Toledo, *ibid.*; Parsons' only ambition, 153; solidarity with Spaniards, 280; no small injury to, 292; prudent custom of, 423, note; suppressed, 471, etc.; restored by Pius VII., 474; has a golden opportunity, *ibid.*

Sodality, The: 44, 63; condemned at Rome, 423, note.

Sorbonne, The: on Jesuit anti-episcopal writings, 420.

Southwell, Fr.: and Elizabeth, 149, 161; a good man, 168; and mental reservation, *ibid.*; is tortured, 169; tried and executed, 170; and Equivocation, 326.

Spain: *See also under* Philip II.—and Rome, 8; their system, *ibid.*; monopoly, 9; her mark on the Society, *ibid.*; Jesuits of, in rebellion, 12; intends an invasion, 19; imperilled by France, 69; theological speculations in, 103; dissatisfaction among Jesuits, *ibid.*; their bitter feelings, *ibid.*; does not desire Elizabeth's conversion, 115; to dominate Europe, 118; reasons of pensions to seminaries, *ibid.*; rebellion against Aquaviva, 130; disloyalty of seminaries, 137, 138; appreciation of treachery, *ibid.* and note; treatment of converts and exiles, 139; distrust of English, 140; more orthodox than Rome, 234, note; the Pope chaplain to the King of, 273; English monks in, 333, 334; matrimonial alliance, 406.

Spiritual Exercises, The: their origin, 27; their method, *ibid.*; their object, 28; and Parsons, *ibid.*; and Fr. Gerard, 162.

Squire, Adam: 20; quarrels with Parsons, 22.

St. Cyran: 420.

St. Omer: 401.

Standish, James: equivocates, 213; is rewarded, 214.

Stanley, Sir William: a traitor, 120; how regarded at home, 121.

Stanney, Fr.: 121.

Statements *v.* facts: 283.

Stonor, Bishop: and the Jesuits, 465, 471.

Stonyhurst, 473, 474.

"Straw, The Holy": 322: examination of, 323; *crescit eundo*, 324.

Stuart, James: a Jesuit novice, 435.

Stuarts, The: a lost cause, 462.

Stuckley, Sir Thomas: 38.

Suarez, Fr.: on angels, 103, note; on regicide, 357.

Sunderland, Lord: deceives Petre, 447.

Swift, Dean: and Parsons' style, 476.

Talbot, Fr.: 238.

Tassis, De: annoyed with Parsons, 107.

Taunton: Black Canons at, 14.

Temporal pretensions of Rome: 2, 351. *See also* Oath.

Ten Reasons, The: 68, 74, 75.

Terriesi: 448.

Test Act, The: 438.

Theological opinion test of orthodoxy, A: 357.

Thorpe, Fr.: libel on Clement XIV., 473; is punished, 474.

Tichborne, Fr.: 233.

Tierney, Canon: his work stopped, 470.

Toledo, Cardinal: 144; and the Society, 152; supports the students, 178, 199; and Parsons' little list, *ibid.*

Toleration: an attempt to purchase, 71, 288; in England, 232.

Tonge, D.: a reverend performer, 439.

Topcliffe: and Gerard, 165; and Anne Bellamy, 169; and Southwell, *ibid.*

Touchstone of orthodoxy, A: 357.

Trade and Jesuits: 414, 421.

Treason: with Spain, 278, 282.

Treaties: of Breda, 436; of Dover, 438.

Treatise to Mitigation, A: 385.

Trent, Council of: and Rome, 7; opposition to, *ibid.*; and Reformation, *ibid.*; and Jesuits, 10.

Tresham, Francis: and Garnett, 277, 278, note.

Trinity College, Dublin: and the Jesuits, 459.

Truth: dangerous views on, 325.

Tu Quoque, A: 460.

"Turbulent Gentleman," The: his history, 466, etc.

Tuscany, Grand Duke of: 448.

Two Types of Jesuits, The: 13.

Tyrrell, Anthony: his doubts resolved, 160.

niformity, Act of: 437.
nnecessary seminaries: 128, note.
rban VI., Pope: 1.
seful lessons: 474.

alladolid: seminary at, 135; in debt, 136; friends alienated, *ibid.*; ill-health of students, 138; scenes at, 340; mismanaged, 342.
aux, Anne: 277; goes on a pilgrimage, 300; and Garnett, 310, 311 note, 329, defended, 321.
icars-apostolic: introduction of, 447; and Jesuits, 470, 471.
itelleschi, Fr.: 402.
ituperation: 476; a specimen of, 494.
ows of obedience: for laics, 329.

Vade, Sir William: and Garnett, 311.
Vakeman, Sir George: 439.
Valpole, Fr.: professes to be loyal, 150, note.
Varner, Fr.: the King's confessor, 444, 446, 447, 458; responsible for the catastrophe, 461.
Vatson, Bishop: 174.
Vatson, William: denounced by Garnett, 284; his King, 286.
Vatten: novitiate at, 401.
Veldon, B.: his *Collections*, 446, note.
Veston, Fr.: 31, 155, 157; the exorcist, *ibid.*, 158; imprisonment stops possession, 160; no wilful deceiver, *ibid.*; his autobiography curiously mutilated, 173; at Wisbeach, 174; di cts, 175; causes a schism, *ibid.*; his faction, 176.
"While things are as they are": 46, 52.
White, Dom Augustine: and the Jesuits, 288.
White, Fr.: 431.
White, Webbs: 277 and note.
Whitebread, Fr.: and Titus Oates, 438, 440, 442.
Wilks, John: and the "Holy Straw," 322, 323.
Williams, Thomas: on the Clergy, 415.
Williams, William: 14.
Wilson: Parsons' man, 242.
Windebank, Secretary: and Laud, 421; and Panzani, *ibid.*, 422, 424.
"Windy chimeras": 110.
Winefrid's Well, St.: pilgrimage to, 299, 300.
Winter, Thomas: and Garnett, 277; and Greenway, 278.
Wisbeach Castle: 174.
Wisbeach Stirs, The: the principles at stake, 173; and Weston, 174; and Garnett, 175, 176, 177; and Parsons, 175; disgraceful charges against the Clergy, 176; peace restored, 177; effects in Rome and Flanders, *ibid.*
Wolsey, Cardinal: and the Renascence, 5.
Worthington, Dr.: and Parsons, 182; vows obedience to him, 183; work for Holt, *ibid.*; his vow, 217, 218; appointed rector, *ibid.*, 241; a creature of Parsons, 397; and Creswell, 398; bribed with a mitre, 399; makes peace with the Clergy, *ibid.*; removed by the Jesuits, *ibid.*, 400.
Wright, Fr.: executed, 428.

Yates, Mrs.: her infatuation, 78, 80.
Yelverton, Sir Henry: incredible story of, 409.
York, Archbishopric of: and Petre, 447.
York, Duke of: converted, 436, 437.
Younger, James: informs, 144; letter to Giffard, 182, 183.

THE END

PRINTED BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,
EDINBURGH

PRINTED BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,
EDINBURGH

A CATALOGUE OF BOOKS PUBLISHED BY METHUEN AND COMPANY: LONDON 36 ESSEX STREET W.C.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
GENERAL LITERATURE,	2-20
ANTIQUARY'S BOOKS,	20
BEGINNER'S BOOKS,	20
BUSINESS BOOKS,	20
BYZANTINE TEXTS,	21
CHURCHMAN'S BIBLE,	21
CHURCHMAN'S LIBRARY,	21
CLASSICAL TRANSLATIONS,	22
COMMERCIAL SERIES,	22
CONNOISSEUR'S LIBRARY,	23
LIBRARY OF DEVOTION,	23
ILLUSTRATED POCKET LIBRARY OF PLAIN AND COLOURED BOOKS,	23
JUNIOR EXAMINATION SERIES,	25
METHUEN'S JUNIOR SCHOOL-BOOKS,	25
LEADERS OF RELIGION,	26
LITTLE BLUE BOOKS,	26
LITTLE BOOKS ON ART,	26
LITTLE GALLERIES,	26
LITTLE GUIDES,	27
LITTLE LIBRARY,	27
METHUEN'S MINIATURE LIBRARY,	28
OXFORD BIOGRAPHIES,	28
SCHOOL EXAMINATION SERIES,	29
SOCIAL QUESTIONS OF TO-DAY,	29
TEXTBOOKS OF TECHNOLOGY,	29
HANDBOOKS OF THEOLOGY,	30
METHUEN'S UNIVERSAL LIBRARY,	30
WESTMINSTER COMMENTARIES,	31
FICTION,	32-40
METHUEN'S SHILLING NOVELS,	39
BOOKS FOR BOYS AND GIRLS,	40
NOVELS OF ALEXANDRE DUMAS,	40

MARCH 1905

A CATALOGUE OF

MESSRS. METHUEN'S PUBLICATIONS

Colonial Editions are published of all Messrs. METHUEN'S Novels issued at a price above 2s. 6d., and similar editions are published of some works of General Literature. These are marked in the Catalogue. Colonial editions are only for circulation in the British Colonies and India.

An asterisk denotes that a book in the Press.

PART I.—GENERAL LITERATURE

Abbot (Jacob). See Little Blue Books.

Acatos (M. J.), Modern Language Master at King Edward School, Birmingham. See Junior School Books.

Adams (Frank). JACK SPRATT. With 24 Coloured Pictures. *Super Royal 16mo.* 2s.

Adeney (W. F.), M.A. See Bennett and Adeney.

Æschylus. See Classical Translations.

Æsop. See Illustrated Pocket Library.

Ainsworth (W. Harrison). See Illustrated Pocket Library.

***Alderson (J. P.).** MR. ASQUITH. With Portraits and Illustrations. *Demy 8vo.* 7s. 6d. *net.*

Alexander (William), D.D., Archbishop of Armagh. THOUGHTS AND COUNSELS OF MANY YEARS. Selected by J. H. BURN, B.D. *Demy 16mo.* 2s. 6d.

Alken (Henry). THE NATIONAL SPORTS OF GREAT BRITAIN. With descriptions in English and French. With 51 Coloured Plates. *Royal Folio. Five Guineas net.*

Allen (Jessie). See Little Books on Art.

Allen (J. Romilly), F.S.A. See Antiquary's Books.

Almack (E.). See Little Books on Art.

Amherst (Lady). A SKETCH OF EGYPTIAN HISTORY FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY. With many Illustrations, some of which are in Colour. *Demy 8vo.* 10s. 6d. *net.*

Anderson (F. M.). THE STORY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE FOR CHILDREN With many Illustrations. *Crown 8vo.* 2s.

Andrewes (Bishop). PRECES PRIVATAE. Edited, with Notes, by F. E. BRIGHTMAN, M.A., of Pusey House, Oxford. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Aristophanes. THE FROGS. Translated into English by E. W. HUNTINGFORD, M.A., Professor of Classics in Trinity College, Toronto. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

Aristotle. THE NICOMACHEAN ETHICS. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by JOHN BURNET, M.A., Professor of Greek at St. Andrews. *Demy 8vo.* 10s. 6d. *net.*

Ashton (R.). See Little Blue Books.

Atkins (H. G.). See Oxford Biographies.

Atkinson (C. M.). JEREMY BENTHAM. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.
A biography of this great thinker, and an estimate of his work and influence.

Atkinson (T. D.). A SHORT HISTORY OF ENGLISH ARCHITECTURE. With over 200 Illustrations by the Author and others. *Fcap. 8vo.* 3s. 6d. *net.*

Aurelius (Marcus). See Methuen's Universal Library.

Austen (Jane). See Little Library and Methuen's Universal Library.

Aves (Ernest). See Books on Business.

Bacon (Francis). See Little Library and Methuen's Universal Library.

Baden-Powell (R. S. S.), Major-General. THE DOWNFALL OF PREMPEH. A Diary of Life in Ashanti, 1895. With 21 Illustrations and a Map. *Third Edition. Large Crown 8vo.* 6s.
A Colonial Edition is also published.

THE MATABELE CAMPAIGN, 1896. With nearly 100 Illustrations. *Fourth and Cheaper Edition. Large Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Baker (W. G.), M.A. See Junior Examination Series.

Baker (Julian L.), F.I.C., F.C.S. See Books on Business.

Balfour (Graham). THE LIFE OF ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. *Second Edition. Two Volumes. Demy 8vo.* 25*s. net.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Bally (S. E.). See Commercial Series.

Banks (Elizabeth L.). THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A 'NEWSPAPER GIRL. With a Portrait of the Author and her Dog. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Barham (R. H.). See Little Library.

Baring-Gould (S.). Author of 'Mehalah,' etc. THE LIFE OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE. With over 450 Illustrations in the Text, and 12 Photogravure Plates. *Gilt top. Large quarto.* 36*s.*

THE TRAGEDY OF THE CÆSARS. With numerous Illustrations from Busts Gems, Cameos, etc. *Fifth Edition. Royal 8vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

A BOOK OF FAIRY TALES. With numerous Illustrations and Initial Letters by ARTHUR J. GASKIN. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Buckram.* 6*s.*

A BOOK OF BRITTANY. With numerous Illustrations. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*
Uniform in scope and size with Mr. Baring-Gould's well-known books on Devon, Cornwall, and Dartmoor.

OLD ENGLISH FAIRY TALES. With numerous Illustrations by F. D. BEDFORD. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Buckram.* 6*s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

THE VICAR OF MORWENSTOW: A Biography. A new and Revised Edition. With a Portrait. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
A completely new edition of the well-known biography of R. S. Hawker.

DARTMOOR: A Descriptive and Historical Sketch. With Plans and numerous Illustrations. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

THE BOOK OF THE WEST. With numerous Illustrations. *Two volumes.* Vol. I. Devon. *Second Edition.* Vol. II. Cornwall. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6*s. each.*

A BOOK OF NORTH WALES. With numerous Illustrations. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*
This book is uniform with Mr. Baring-Gould's books on Devon, Dartmoor, and Brittany.

*A BOOK OF SOUTH WALES. With many Illustrations. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

A BOOK OF GHOSTS. With 8 Illustrations by D. Murray Smith. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

OLD COUNTRY LIFE. With 67 Illustrations. *Fifth Edition. Large Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

*AN OLD ENGLISH HOME. With numerous Plans and Illustrations. *Cr. 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

*YORKSHIRE ODDITIES AND STRANGE EVENTS. *Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

*STRANGE SURVIVALS AND SUPERSTITIONS. *Third Edition. Cr. 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

A GARLAND OF COUNTRY SONG: English Folk Songs with their Traditional Melodies. Collected and arranged by S. BARING-GOULD and H. F. SHEPPARD. *Demy 4to.* 6*s.*

SONGS OF THE WEST: Traditional Ballads and Songs of the West of England, with their Melodies. Collected by S. BARING-GOULD, M.A., and H. F. SHEPPARD, M.A. In 4 Parts. *Parts I., II., III.,* 2*s.* 6*d. each. Part IV.,* 4*s. In One Volume, French Morocco,* 10*s. net.; Roan,* 15*s.*
See also The Little Guides.

Barker (Aldred F.), Author of 'Pattern Analysis,' etc. See Textbooks of Technology.

Barnes (W. E.), D.D., Hulsaean Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. See Churchman's Bible.

Barnett (Mrs. P. A.). See Little Library.

Baron (R. R. N.), M.A. FRENCH PROSE COMPOSITION. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d. Key,* 3*s. net.* See also Junior School Books.

Barron (H. M.), M.A., Wadham College, Oxford. TEXTS FOR SERMONS. With a Preface by Canon SCOTT HOLLAND. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Bastable (C. F.), M.A., Professor of Economics at Trinity College, Dublin. See Social Questions Series.

Batson (Mrs. Stephen). A BOOK OF THE COUNTRY AND THE GARDEN. Illustrated by F. CARRUTHERS GOULD and A. C. GOULD. *Demy 8vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

A CONCISE HANDBOOK OF GARDEN FLOWERS. *Fcap. 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

***Batten (Loring W.)**, Ph.D., S.T.D., Rector of St. Mark's Church, New York; sometime Professor in the Philadelphia Divinity School. THE HEBREW PROPHET. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

Beaman (A. Hulme). PONS ASINORUM; OR, A GUIDE TO BRIDGE. *Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 2s.*

Beard (W. S.). See Junior Examination Series.

EASY EXERCISES IN ARITHMETIC. Arranged by. *Cr. 8vo.* Without Answers, 1s. With Answers, 1s. 3d.

Beckford (Peter). THOUGHTS ON HUNTING. Edited by J. OTHO PAGET, and Illustrated by G. H. JALLAND. *Second and Cheaper Edition. Demy 8vo. 6s.*

Beckford (William). See Little Library.

Beeching (H. C.), M.A., Canon of Westminster. See Library of Devotion.

Behmen (Jacob). THE SUPERSENSUAL LIFE. Edited by BERNARD HOLLAND. *Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Belloc (Hilaire). PARIS. With Maps and Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Bellot (H. H. L.), M.A. THE INNER AND MIDDLE TEMPLE. With numerous Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 6s. net.*

See also **L. A. A. Jones.**

Bennett (W. H.), M.A. A PRIMER OF THE BIBLE. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Bennett (W. H.) and Adeney (W. F.). A BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Benson (Archbishop). GOD'S BOARD: Communion Addresses. *Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

Benson (A. C.), M.A. See Oxford Biographies.

Benson (R. M.). THE WAY OF HOLINESS: a Devotional Commentary on the 119th Psalm. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

Bernard (E. R.), M.A., Canon of Salisbury. THE ENGLISH SUNDAY. *Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

Bertouch (Baroness de). THE LIFE OF FATHER IGNATIUS, O.S.B., THE MONK OF LLANTHONY. With Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*

A Colonial Edition is also published.

Bethune-Baker (J. F.), M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge. See Handbooks of Theology.

Bidez (M.). See Byzantine Texts.

Biggs (C. R. D.), D.D. See Churchman's Bible.

Bindley (T. Herbert), B.D. THE OECUMENICAL DOCUMENTS OF THE FAITH. With Introductions and Notes. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

A historical account of the Creeds.

Binyon (Laurence). THE DEATH OF ADAM, AND OTHER POEMS. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

Birnstingl (Ethel). See Little Books on Art.

Blair (Robert). See Illustrated Pocket Library.

Blake (William). See Illustrated Pocket Library and Little Library.

Blaxland (B.), M.A. See Library of Devotion.

Bloom (T. Harvey), M.A. SHAKESPEARE'S GARDEN. With Illustrations. *Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.; leather. 4s. 6d. net.*

Blouet (Henri). See The Beginner's Books.

Boardman (T. H.). See Text Books of Technology.

Bodley (J. E. C.). Author of 'France.' THE CORONATION OF EDWARD VII. *Demy 8vo. 21s. net.* By Command of the King.

Body (George), D.D. THE SOUL'S PILGRIMAGE: Devotional Readings from his published and unpublished writings. Selected and arranged by J. H. BURN, B.D. F.R.S.E. *Pott 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Bona (Cardinal). See Library of Devotion.

Boon (F. C.). See Commercial Series.

Borrow (George). See Little Library.

Bos (J. Ritzema). AGRICULTURAL ZOOLOGY. Translated by J. R. AINSWORTH DAVIS, M.A. With an Introduction by ELEANOR A. ORMEROD, F.E.S. With 155 Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. Third Edition. 3s. 6d.*

Botting (C. G.), B.A. EASY GREEK EXERCISES. *Crown 8vo. 2s.* See also Junior Examination Series.

Boulton (E. S.). GEOMETRY ON MODERN LINES. *Crown 8vo. 2s.*

Bowden (E. M.). THE IMITATION OF BUDDHA: Being Quotations from Buddhist Literature for each Day in the Year. *Fourth Edition. Crown 16mo. 2s. 6d.*

Boyle (W.). CHRISTMAS AT THE ZOO. With Verses by W. BOYLE and 24 Coloured Pictures by H. B. NEILSON. *Super Royal 16mo. 2s.*

Brabant (F. G.), M.A. See The Little Guides.

Brodrick (Mary) and Morton (Anderson). A CONCISE HANDBOOK OF EGYPTIAN ARCHÆOLOGY. With many Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Brooke (A S.), M.A. SLINGSBY AND SLINGSBY CASTLE. With many Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Brooks (E. W.). See Byzantine Texts.

Brown (P. H.), Fraser Professor of Ancient (Scottish) History at the University of Edinburgh. SCOTLAND IN THE TIME OF QUEEN MARY. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Browne (Sir Thomas). See Methuen's Universal Library.

Brownell (C. L.). THE HEART OF JAPAN. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.; also Demy 8vo. 6d.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Browning (Robert). See Little Library.

Buckland (Francis T.). CURIOSITIES OF NATURAL HISTORY. With Illustrations by HARRY B. NEILSON. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Buckton (A. M.). THE BURDEN OF ENGELA: a Ballad-Epic. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*
EAGER HEART: A Mystery Play. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 1s. net.*

Budge (E. A. Wallis). THE GODS OF THE EGYPTIANS. With over 100 Coloured Plates and many Illustrations. *Two Volumes. Royal 8vo. £3, 3s. net.*

Bull (Paul), Army Chaplain. GOD AND OUR SOLDIERS. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Bulley (Miss). See Social Questions Series.

Bunyan (John). THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. Edited, with an Introduction, by C. H. FIRTH, M.A. With 39 Illustrations by R. ANNING BELL. *Cr. 8vo. 6s.* See also Library of Devotion and Methuen's Universal Library.

Burch (G. J.), M.A., F.R.S. A MANUAL OF ELECTRICAL SCIENCE. With numerous Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 3s.*

Burgess (Gelett). GOOPS AND HOW TO BE THEM. With numerous Illustrations. *Small 4to. 6s.*

Burke (Edmund). See Methuen's Universal Library.

Burn (A. E.), D.D., Prebendary of Lichfield. See Handbooks of Theology.

Burn (J. H.), B.D. See Library of Devotion.

Burnand (Sir F. C.). RECORDS AND REMINISCENCES, PERSONAL AND GENERAL. With many Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. Two Volumes. Third Edition. 25s. net.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Burns (Robert), THE POEMS OF. Edited by ANDREW LANG and W. A. CRAIGIE. With Portrait. *Third Edition. Demy 8vo, gilt top. 6s.*

Burnside (W. F.), M.A. OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY FOR USE IN SCHOOLS. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Burton (Alfred). See Illustrated Pocket Library.

Butler (Joseph). See Methuen's Universal Library.

Caldecott (Alfred), D.D. See Handbooks of Theology.

Calderwood (D. S.), Headmaster of the Normal School, Edinburgh. TEST CARDS IN EUCLID AND ALGEBRA. In three packets of 40, with Answers. *1s.* each. Or in three Books, price *2d.*, *2d.*, and *3d.*

Cambridge (Ada) [Mrs. Cross]. THIRTY YEARS IN AUSTRALIA. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Canning (George). See Little Library.

Capey (E. F. H.). See Oxford Biographies.

Careless (John). See Illustrated Pocket Library.

Carlyle (Thomas). THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. Edited by C. R. L. FLETCHER, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. *Three Volumes. Crown 8vo. 18s.*
THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF OLIVER CROMWELL. With an Introduction by C. H. FIRTH, M.A., and Notes and Appendices by Mrs. S. C. LOMAS. *Three Volumes. Demy 8vo. 18s. net.*

Carlyle (R. M. and A. J.), M.A. See Leaders of Religion.

Chamberlin (Wilbur B.). ORDERED TO CHINA. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Channer (C. C.) and Roberts (M. E.). LACE-MAKING IN THE MIDLANDS, PAST AND PRESENT. With 16 full-page Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Chatterton (Thomas). See Methuen's Universal Library.

Chesterfield (Lord), THE LETTERS OF, TO HIS SON. Edited, with an Introduction by C. STRACHEY, and Notes by A. CALTHROP. *Two Volumes. Cr. 8vo. 12s.*

Christian (F. W.) THE CAROLINE ISLANDS. With many Illustrations and Maps. *Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*

Cicero. See Classical Translations.

Clarke (F. A.), M.A. See Leaders of Religion.

Cleather (A. L.) and Crump (B.). RICHARD WAGNER'S MUSIC DRAMAS: Interpretations, embodying Wagner's own explanations. *In Four Volumes. Fcap 8vo. 2s. 6d. each.*

VOL. I.—THE RING OF THE NIBELUNG.

VOL. II.—PARSIFAL, LOHENGRIN, and THE HOLY GRAIL.

Clinch (G.) See The Little Guides.

Clough (W. T.), Head of the Phvsical Department East Ham Technical College. See Junior School Books.

Coast (W. G), B.A. EXAMINATION PAPERS IN VERGIL. *Crown 8vo. 2s.*

Cobb (T.). See Little Blue Books.

Collingwood (W. G.), M.A. THE LIFE OF JOHN RUSKIN. With Portraits. *Second and Cheap Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s.* Also a Popular Edition. *Cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.*

Collins (W. E.), M.A. See Churchman's Library.

Colonna. HYPNEROTOMACHIA POLIPHILI UBI HUMANA OMNIA NON NISI SOMNIUM ESSE DOCET ATQUE OBITER PLURIMA SCITU SANE QUAM DIGNA COMMEMORAT. An edition limited to 350 copies on handmade paper. *Folio. Three Guineas net.*

Combe (William). See Illustrated Pocket Library.

Cook (A. M.), M.A. See E. C. Marchant.

Cooke-Taylor (R. W.). See Social Questions Series.

Corelli (Marie). THE PASSING OF THE GREAT QUEEN: A Tribute to the Noble Life of Victoria Regina. *Small 4to. 1s.*

A CHRISTMAS GREETING. *Sm. 4to. 1s.*

Corkran (Alice). See Little Books on Art.

Cotes (Rosemary). DANTE'S GARDEN. With a Frontispiece. *Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. cloth 2s. 6d.; leather, 3s. 6d. net.*

BIBLE FLOWERS. With a Frontispiece and Plan. *Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.*

Cowley (Abraham). See Little Library.

Cox (J. Charles), LL.D., F.S.A. See Little Guides.

Cox (Harold), B.A. See Social Questions Series.

Crabbe (George). See Little Library.

Craigie (W. A.). A PRIMER OF BURNS. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Craik (Mrs.). See Little Library.

Crashaw (Richard). See Little Library.

Crawford (F. G.). See Mary C. Danson.

Crouch (W.). BRYAN KING. With a Portrait. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

Cruikshank (G.) THE LOVING BALLAD OF LORD BATEMAN. With 11 Plates. *Crown 16mo. 1s. 6d. net.*

From the edition published by C. Tilt, 1811.

Crump (B.). See A. L. Cleather.

Cunliffe (F. H. E.), Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. THE HISTORY OF THE BOER WAR. With many Illustrations, Plans, and Portraits. *In 2 vols. Quarto. 15s. each.*

Cutts (E. L.), D.D. See Leaders of Religion.

Daniell (G. W.), M.A. See Leaders of Religion.

Danson (Mary C.) and Crawford (F. G.). FATHERS IN THE FAITH. *Small 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

Dante. LA COMMEDIA DI DANTE. The Italian Text edited by PAGET TOYNBEE, M.A., D.Litt. *Crown 8vo. 6s.* See also Paget Toynbee, Little Library, and Methuen's Universal Library.

Darley (George). See Little Library.

Davenport (Cyril). See Connoisseur's Library and Little Books on Art.

Dawson (A. J.). MOROCCO. Being a bundle of jottings, notes, impressions, tales, and tributes. With many Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*

Deane (A. C.). See Little Library.

Delbos (Leon). THE METRIC SYSTEM. *Crown 8vo. 2s.*

Demosthenes: THE OLYNTHIACS AND PHILIPPICS. Translated upon a new principle by OTHO HOLLAND *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Demosthenes. AGAINST CONON AND CALLICLES. Edited with Notes and Vocabulary, by F. DARWIN SWIFT, M.A. *Fcap. 8vo. 2s.*

Dickens (Charles). See Illustrated Pocket Library.

Dickinson (Emily). POEMS. First Series. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. net.*

Dickinson (G. L.), M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. THE GREEK VIEW OF LIFE. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Dickson (H. N.), F.R.S.E., F.R.Met. Soc. METEOROLOGY. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Dilke (Lady). See Social Questions Series.

Dillon (Edward). See Connoisseur's Library.

Ditchfield (P. H.), M.A., F.S.A. ENGLISH VILLAGES. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.*

THE STORY OF OUR ENGLISH TOWNS. With an Introduction by AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, D.D. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

OLD ENGLISH CUSTOMS: Extant at the Present Time. An Account of Local Observances, Festival Customs, and Ancient Ceremonies yet Surviving in Great Britain. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Dixon (W. M.), M.A. A PRIMER OF TENNYSON. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

ENGLISH POETRY FROM BLAKE TO BROWNING. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Dole N. H.). FAMOUS COMPOSERS. With Portraits. *Two Volumes. Demy 8vo. 12s. net.*

Dowden (J.), D.D., Lord Bishop of Edinburgh. See Churchman's Library.

Drage (G.) See Books on Business.

Driver (S. R.), D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford. SERMONS ON SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD TESTAMENT. *Crown 8vo. 6s.* See also Westminster Commentaries.

Dryhurst (A. R.). See Little Books on Art.

Duguid (Charles), City Editor of the *Morning Post*, Author of the 'Story of the Stock Exchange,' etc. See Books on Business.

Duncan (S. J.) (Mrs. COTES), Author of 'A Voyage of Consolation.' ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE LATCH. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Dunn (J. T.), D.Sc., **and Mundella (V. A.).** GENERAL ELEMENTARY SCIENCE. With 114 Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Dunstan (A. E.), B.Sc., Head of the Chemical Department, East Ham Technical College. See Junior School Books.

***Durham (The Earl of).** A REPORT ON CANADA. With an Introductory Note. *Demy 8vo. 4s. 6d. net.*

Dutt (W. A.). A POPULAR GUIDE TO NORFOLK. *Medium 8vo. 6d. net.*

THE NORFOLK BROADS. With coloured and other Illustrations by FRANK SOUTHGATE. *Large Demy 8vo. 21s. net.* See also The Little Guides.

Earle (John), Bishop of Salisbury. MICROCOSMOGRAPHE, OR A PIECE OF THE WORLD DISCOVERED; IN ESSAYES AND CHARACTERS. *Post 16mo. 2s net.*
Reprinted from the Sixth Edition published by Robert Allot in 1633.

Edwards (Clement). See Social Questions Series.

Edwards (W. Douglas). See Commercial Series.

***Edwards (Betham).** HOME LIFE IN FRANCE. With many Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Egan (Pierce). See Illustrated Pocket Library.

Egerton (H. E.), M.A. A HISTORY OF BRITISH COLONIAL POLICY. *Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Ellaby (C. G.). See The Little Guides.

Ellerton (F. G.). See S. J. Stone.

Ellwood (Thomas), THE HISTORY OF THE LIFE OF. Edited by C. G. CRUMP, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Engel (E.). A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE: From its Beginning to Tennyson. Translated from the German. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Fairbrother (W. H.), M.A. THE PHILOSOPHY OF T. H. GREEN. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

FELISSA; OR, THE LIFE AND OPINIONS OF A KITTEN OF SENTIMENT. With 12 Coloured Plates. *Post 16mo. 2s. 6d. net.* (5½×3½).
From the edition published by J. Harris, 1811.

Farrer (Reginald). THE GARDEN OF ASIA. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.
Ferrier (Susan). See Little Library.
Fidler (T. Claxton), M.Inst. C.E., Professor of Engineering, University College, Dundee in the University of St. Andrews. See Books on Business.
Fielding (Henry). See Methuen's Universal Library.
Finn (S. W.), M.A. See Junior Examination Series.
Firth (C. H.), M.A. CROMWELL'S ARMY: A History of the English Soldier during the Civil Wars, the Commonwealth, and the Protectorate. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*
Fisher (G. W.), M.A. ANNALS OF SHREWSBURY SCHOOL. With numerous Illustrations. *Demy* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*
FitzGerald (Edward). THE RUBÁIYÁT OF OMAR KHAYYÁM. Printed from the Fifth and last Edition. With a Commentary by Mrs. STEPHEN BATSON, and a Biography of Omar by E. D. Ross. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.* See also Miniature Library.
Flecker (W. H.), M.A., D.C.L., Headmaster of the Dean Close School, Cheltenham. THE STUDENT'S PRAYER BOOK. Part I. MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER AND LITANY. With an Introduction and Notes. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*
Flux (A. W.), M.A., William Dow Professor of Political Economy in M'Gill University, Montreal: sometime Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and formerly Stanley-Jevons Professor of Political Economy in the Owens Coll., Manchester. ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES. *Demy* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*
Fortescue (Mrs. G.) See Little Books on Art.
Fraser (David). A MODERN CAMPAIGN; OR, WAR AND WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY IN THE FAR EAST. Illustrated. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*
Fraser (J. F.). ROUND THE WORLD ON A WHEEL. With 100 Illustrations. *Third Edition Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.
French (W.). See Textbooks of Technology.
Freudenreich (Ed. von). DAIRY BACTERIOLOGY. A Short Manual for the Use of Students. Translated by J. R. AINSWORTH DAVIS, M.A. *Second Edition. Revised. Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*
Fulford (H. W.), M.A. See Churchman's Bible.
C. G., and F. C. G. JOHN BULL'S ADVENTURES IN THE FISCAL WONDERLAND. By CHARLES GEAKE. With 46 Illustrations by F. CARRUTHERS GOULD. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*
Gallichan (W. M.). See The Little Guides.
Gambado (Geoffrey, Esq.). See Illustrated Pocket Library.
Gaskell (Mrs.). See Little Library.
Gasquet, the Right Rev. Abbot, O.S.B. See Antiquary's Books.
George (H. B.), M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford. BATTLES OF ENGLISH HISTORY. With numerous Plans. *Fourth Edition.* Revised, with a new Chapter including the South African War. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*
A HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
Gibbins (H. de B.), Litt.D., M.A. INDUSTRY IN ENGLAND: HISTORICAL OUTLINES. With 5 Maps. *Third Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*
A COMPANION GERMAN GRAMMAR. *Crown* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*
THE INDUSTRIAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND. *Tenth Edition.* Revised. With Maps and Plans. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.*
ENGLISH SOCIAL REFORMERS. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*
See also Commercial Series and Social Questions Series.
Gibbon (Edward). THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. A New Edition, edited with Notes, Appendices, and Maps, by J. B. BURY, M.A., Litt.D., Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge. *In Seven Volumes. Demy* 8*vo. Gilt top,* 8*s.* 6*d. each. Also, Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s. each.*
MEMOIRS OF MY LIFE AND WRITINGS. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by G. BIRKBECK HILL, LL.D. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*
See also Methuen's Universal Library.
Gibson (E. C. S.), D.D., Vicar of Leeds. See Westminster Commentaries, Handbooks of Theology, and Oxford Biographies.
Gilbert (A. R.). See Little Books on Art.
Godfrey (Elizabeth). A BOOK OF REMEMBRANCE. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*
Godley (A. D.), M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. LYRA FRIVOLA. *Third Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*
VERSES TO ORDER. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*
SECOND STRINGS. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Goldsmith (Oliver). THE VICAR OF WAKEFIELD. With 24 Coloured Plates by T. ROWLANDSON. *Royal 8vo. One Guinea net.*
Reprinted from the edition of 1817. Also *Fcap. 32mo.* With 10 Plates in Photogravure by Tony Johannot. *Leather, 2s. 6d. net.* See also Illustrated Pocket Library and Methuen's Universal Library.
Goudge (H. L.), M.A., Principal of Wells Theological College. See Westminster Commentaries.
Graham (P. Anderson). See Social Questions Series.
Granger (F. S.), M.A., Litt.D. PSYCHOLOGY. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
THE SOUL OF A CHRISTIAN. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gray (E. M'Queen). GERMAN PASSAGES FOR UNSEEN TRANSLATION. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
Gray (P. L.), B.Sc., formerly Lecturer in Physics in Mason University College, Birmingham. THE PRINCIPLES OF MAGNETISM AND ELECTRICITY: an Elementary Text-Book. With 181 Diagrams. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Green (G. Buckland), M.A., Assistant Master at Edinburgh Academy, late Fellow of St. John's College, Oxon. NOTES ON GREEK AND LATIN SYNTAX. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Green (E. T.), M.A. See Churchman's Library.
Greenidge (A. H. J.), M.A. A HISTORY OF ROME: During the Later Republic and the Early Principate. *In Six Volumes. Demy 8vo.* Vol. I. (133-104 B.C.). *10s. 6d. net.*
Greenwell (Dora). See Miniature Library.
Gregory (R. A.) THE VAULT OF HEAVEN. A Popular Introduction to Astronomy. With numerous Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
Gregory (Miss E. C.). See Library of Devotion.
Greville Minor. A MODERN JOURNAL. Edited by J. A. SPENDER. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*
Grinling (C. H.). A HISTORY OF THE GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY, 1845-95. With Illustrations. Revised, with an additional chapter. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.*
Grubb (H. C.). See Textbooks of Technology.
Guiney (Louisa I.). HURRELL FROUDE: Memoranda and Comments. Illustrated. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*
Gwynn (M. L.). A BIRTHDAY BOOK. *Royal 8vo. 12s.*
Hackett (John), B.D. A HISTORY OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH OF CYPRUS. With Maps and Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 15s. net.*
Haddon (A. C.), Sc.D., F.R.S. HEAD-HUNTERS, BLACK, WHITE, AND BROWN. With many Illustrations and a Map. *Demy 8vo. 15s.*
Hadfield (R. A.). See Social Questions Series.
Hall (R. N.) and Neal (W. G.). THE ANCIENT RUINS OF RHODESIA. With numerous Illustrations. *Second Edition, revised. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*
Hall (R. N.). GREAT ZIMBABWE. With numerous Plans and Illustrations. *Royal 8vo. 21s. net.*
Hamilton (F. J.), D.D. See Byzantine Texts.
Hammond (J. L.). CHARLES JAMES FOX: A Biographical Study. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.*
Hannay (D.). A SHORT HISTORY OF THE ROYAL NAVY, FROM EARLY TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY. Illustrated. *Two Volumes. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. each.*
Vol. I. 1200-1688.
Hannay (James O.), M.A. THE SPIRIT AND ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN MONASTICISM. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE WISDOM OF THE DESERT. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*
Hare, (A. T.), M.A. THE CONSTRUCTION OF LARGE INDUCTION COILS. With numerous Diagrams. *Demy 8vo. 6s.*
Harrison (Clifford). READING AND READERS. *Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
Hawthorne (Nathaniel). See Little Library.
HEALTH, WEALTH AND WISDOM. *Crown 8vo. 1s. net.*
Heath (Frank R.). See The Little Guides.
Heath (Dudley). See Connoisseur's Library.
Hello (Ernest). STUDIES IN SAINTSHIP. Translated from the French by V. M. CRAWFORD. *Fcap 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Henderson (B. W.), Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. THE LIFE AND PRINCIPATE OF THE EMPEROR NERO. With Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*
Henderson (T. F.). See Little Library and Oxford Biographies.
Henley (W. E.). ENGLISH LYRICS. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.*
Henley (W. E.) and Whibley (C.). A BOOK OF ENGLISH PROSE. *Crown 8vo. Buckram, gilt top. 6s.*
Henson (H. H.), B.D., Canon of Westminster. APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY: As Illustrated by the Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

LIGHT AND LEAVEN: HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SERMONS. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
DISCIPLINE AND LAW. *Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
Herbert (George). See Library of Devotion.
Herbert of Cherbury (Lord). See Miniature Library.
Hewins (W. A. S.), B.A. ENGLISH TRADE AND FINANCE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
Heywood (W.). PALIO AND PONTE: A Book of Tuscan Games. Illustrated. *Royal 8vo. 21s. net.*
Hilbert (T.). See Little Blue Books.
Hill (Clare), Registered Teacher to the City and Guilds of London Institute. See Textbooks of Technology.
Hill (Henry), B.A., Headmaster of the Boy's High School, Worcester, Cape Colony. A SOUTH AFRICAN ARITHMETIC. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
This book has been specially written for use in South African schools.
Hillegas (Howard C.). WITH THE BOER FORCES. With 24 Illustrations. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Hobhouse (Emily). THE BRUNT OF THE WAR. With Map and Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.
Hobhouse (L. T.), Fellow of C.C.C., Oxford. THE THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*
Hobson (J. A.), M.A. INTERNATIONAL TRADE: A Study of Economic Principles. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.* See also Social Questions Series.
Hodgkin (T.), D.C.L. See Leaders of Religion.
Hogg (Thomas Jefferson). SHELLEY AT OXFORD. With an Introduction by R. A. STREATFEILD. *Fcap. 8vo. 2s. net.*
Holden-Stone (G. de). See Books on Business.
Holdich (Sir T. H.), K.C.I.E. THE INDIAN BORDERLAND: being a Personal Record of Twenty Years. Illustrated. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*
Holdsworth (W. S.), M.A. A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LAW. *In Two Volumes. Vol. I. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*
Holyoake (G. J.). See Social Questions Series.
Hoppner. See Little Galleries.
Horace. See Classical Translations.
Horsburgh (E. L. S.), M.A. WATERLOO: A Narrative and Criticism. With Plans. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.* See also Oxford Biographies.
Horth (A. C.), Master of Art and Manual Training Departments, Roan School, Greenwich. See Textbooks of Technology.
Horton (R. F.), D.D. See Leaders of Religion.
Hosie (Alexander). MANCHURIA. With Illustrations and a Map. *Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*
How (F. D.). SIX GREAT SCHOOLMASTERS. With Portraits and Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.*
Howell (G.). See Social Questions Series.
Hudson (Robert). MEMORIALS OF A WARWICKSHIRE PARISH. With many Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 15s. net.*
Hughes (C. E.). THE PRAISE OF SHAKESPEARE. An English Anthology. With a Preface by SIDNEY LEE. *Demy 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*
Hughes (Thomas). TOM BROWN'S SCHOOLDAYS. With an Introduction and Notes by VERNON RENDALL. *Leather. Royal 32mo. 2s. 6d. net.*
Hutchinson (Horace G.). THE NEW FOREST. Described by. Illustrated in colour with 50 Pictures by WALTER TYNDALE and 4 by Miss LUCY KEMP WELCH. *Large Demy 8vo. 21s. net.*
Hutton (A. W.), M.A. See Leaders of Religion.
Hutton (R. H.). See Leaders of Religion.
Hutton (W. H.), M.A. THE LIFE OF SIR THOMAS MORE. With Portraits. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.* See also Leaders of Religion.
Hyett (F. A.). A SHORT HISTORY OF FLORENCE. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*
Ibsen (Henrik). BRAND. A Drama. Translated by WILLIAM WILSON. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Inge (W. R.), M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford. CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM. The Bampton Lectures for 1899. *Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.* See also Library of Devotion.
Innes (A. D.), M.A. A HISTORY OF THE BRITISH IN INDIA. With Maps and Plans. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Jackson (S.), M.A. See Commercial Series.
Jackson (F. Hamilton). See The Little Guides.
Jacob (F.), M.A. See Junior Examination Series.
Jeans (J. Stephen). See Social Questions Series.
Jeffreys (D. Gwyn). DOLLY'S THEATRICALS. Described and Illustrated with 24 Coloured Pictures. *Super Royal 16mo. 2s. 6d.*
Jenks (E.), M.A., Reader of Law in the University of Oxford. ENGLISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
Jessopp (Augustus), D.D. See Leaders of Religion.
Jevons (F. B.), M.A., Litt.D., Principal of Hatfield Hall, Durham. See Churchman's Library and Handbooks of Theology.
Johnson (Mrs. Barham). WILLIAM BODHAM DONNE AND HIS FRIENDS. With Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*
Johnston (Sir H. H.), K.C.B. BRITISH CENTRAL AFRICA. With nearly 200 Illustrations and Six Maps. *Second Edition. Crown 4to. 18s. net.*
Jones (H.). See Commercial Series.
Jones (L. A. Atherley), K.C., M.P., and **Bellot (Hugh H. L.)**. THE MINERS' GUIDE TO THE COAL MINES' REGULATION ACTS. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.*
Jonson (Ben). See Methuen's Universal Library.
Julian (Lady) of Norwich. REVELATIONS OF DIVINE LOVE. Edited by GRACE WARRACK. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Juvenal. See Classical Translations.
Kaufmann (M.). See Social Questions Series.
Keating (J. F.), D.D. THE AGAPE AND THE EUCHARIST. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Keats (John). THE POEMS OF. Edited with Introduction and Notes by E. de Selincourt, M.A. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.* See also Little Library and Methuen's Universal Library.
Keble (John). THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. With an Introduction and Notes by W. LOCK, D.D., Warden of Keble College. Illustrated by R. ANNING BELL. *Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.; padded morocco, 5s.* See also Library of Devotion.
Kempis (Thomas A). THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. With an Introduction by DEAN FARRAR. Illustrated by C. M. GERE. *Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.; padded morocco, 5s.* See also Library of Devotion and Methuen's Universal Library.
Also Translated by C. BIGG, D.D. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Kennedy (James Houghton), D.D., Assistant Lecturer in Divinity in the University of Dublin. ST. PAUL'S SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS. With Introduction, Dissertations and Notes. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Kestell (J. D.). THROUGH SHOT AND FLAME: Being the Adventures and Experiences of J. D. KESTELL, Chaplain to General Christian de Wet. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Kimmins (C. W.), M.A. THE CHEMISTRY OF LIFE AND HEALTH. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
Kinglake (A. W.). See Little Library.
Kipling (Rudyard). BARRACK-ROOM BALLADS. *73rd Thousand. Cr. 8vo. Twentieth Edition. 6s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.
THE SEVEN SEAS. *62nd Thousand. Ninth Edition. Crown 8vo, gilt top, 6s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.
THE FIVE NATIONS. *41st Thousand. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.
DEPARTMENTAL DITTIES. *Sixteenth Edition. Crown 8vo. Buckram. 6s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.
Knowling (R. J.), M.A., Professor of New Testament Exegesis at King's College, London. See Westminster Commentaries.
Lamb (Charles and Mary), THE WORKS OF. Edited by E. V. LUCAS. With Numerous Illustrations. *In Seven Volumes. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. each.*
THE ESSAYS OF ELIA. With over 100 Illustrations by A. GARTH JONES, and an Introduction by E. V. LUCAS. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.*
THE KING AND QUEEN OF HEARTS: An 1805 Book for Children. Illustrated by WILLIAM MULREADY. A new edition, in facsimile, edited by E. V. LUCAS. *1s. 6d.*
See also Little Library.
Lambert (F. A. H.). See The Little Guides.
Lambros (Professor). See Byzantine Texts.
Lane-Poole (Stanley). A HISTORY OF EGYPT IN THE MIDDLE AGES. Fully Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Langbridge (F.) M.A. BALLADS OF THE BRAVE: Poems of Chivalry, Enterprise, Courage, and Constancy. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Law (William). See Library of Devotion.

Leach (Henry). THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE. A Biography. With 12 Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

***Lee (Captain L. Melville).** A HISTORY OF POLICE IN ENGLAND. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*

Leigh (Percival). THE COMIC ENGLISH GRAMMAR. Embellished with upwards of 50 characteristic Illustrations by JOHN LEECH. *Post 16mo. 2s. 6d. net.*

Lewes (V. B.), M.A. AIR AND WATER. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Lisle (Fortunée de). See Little Books on Art.

Littlehales (H.). See Antiquary's Books.

Lock (Walter), D.D., Warden of Keble College. ST. PAUL, THE MASTER-BUILDER. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.* See also Leaders of Religion.

Locke (John). See Methuen's Universal Library.

Locker (F.). See Little Library.

Longfellow (H. W.) See Little Library.

Lorimer (George Horace). LETTERS FROM A SELF-MADE MERCHANT TO HIS SON. *Twelfth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

OLD GORGON GRAHAM. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Lover (Samuel). See Illustrated Pocket Library

E. V. L. and **C. L. G.** ENGLAND DAY BY DAY: Or, The Englishman's Handbook to Efficiency. Illustrated by GEORGE MORROW. *Fourth Edition. Fcap. 4to. 1s. net.*
A burlesque Year-Book and Almanac.

Lucas (E. V.). THE LIFE OF CHARLES LAMB. With numerous Portraits and Illustrations. *Two Vols. Demy 8vo. 21s. net.*

Lucian. See Classical Translations.

Lyde (L. W.), M.A. See Commercial Series.

Lydon (Noel S.). See Junior School Books.

Lyttelton (Hon. Mrs. A.). WOMEN AND THEIR WORK. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

M. M. HOW TO DRESS AND WHAT TO WEAR. *Crown 8vo, 1s. net.*

Macaulay (Lord). CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS. Edited by F. C. MONTAGUE, M.A. *Three Volumes. Cr. 8vo. 18s.*
The only edition of this book completely annotated.

M'Allen (J. E. B.), M.A. See Commercial Series.

MacCulloch (J. A.). See Churchman's Library.

MacCunn (F.). See Leaders of Religion.

McDermott, (E. R.), Editor of the *Railway News*, City Editor of the *Daily News*. See Books on Business.

M'Dowall (A. S.). See Oxford Biographies.

Mackay (A. M.). See Churchman's Library.

Magnus (Laurie), M.A. A PRIMER OF WORDSWORTH. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Mahaffy (J. P.), Litt.D. A HISTORY OF THE EGYPT OF THE PTOLEMIES. Fully Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Maitland (F. W.), LL.D., Downing Professor of the Laws of England in the University of Cambridge. CANON LAW IN ENGLAND. *Royal 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Malden (H. E.), M.A. ENGLISH RECORDS. A Companion to the History of England. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE ENGLISH CITIZEN: HIS RIGHTS AND DUTIES. *Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

Marchant (E. C.), M.A., Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge. A GREEK ANTHOLOGY. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Marchant (E. C.), M.A., and **Cook (A. M.),** M.A. PASSAGES FOR UNSEEN TRANSLATION. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Marlowe (Christopher). See Methuen's Universal Library.

Marr (J. E.), F.R.S., Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge. THE SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF SCENERY. *Second Edition.* Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

AGRICULTURAL GEOLOGY. With numerous Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Marvell (Andrew). See Little Library.

Maskell (A.) See Connoisseur's Library.

Mason (A. J.), D.D. See Leaders of Religion.

Massee (George). THE EVOLUTION OF PLANT LIFE: Lower Forms. With Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Masterman (C. F. G.), M.A. TENNYSON AS A RELIGIOUS TEACHER. *Cr. 8vo. 6s.*
May (Phil). THE PHIL MAY ALBUM. *Second Edition. 4to. 1s. net.*
Mellows (Emma S.). A SHORT STORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Michell (E. B). THE ART AND PRACTICE OF HAWKING. With 3 Photogravures by G. E. LODGE, and other Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.*
***Millais (J. G.).** THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF SIR JOHN EVERETT MILLAIS, President of the Royal Academy. With 319 Illustrations, of which 9 are in Photogravure. *New Edition. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*
Millais (Sir John Everett). See Little Galleries.
Millis (C. T.), M.I.M.E., Principal of the Borough Polytechnic College. See Textbooks of Technology.
Milne (J. G.), M.A. A HISTORY OF ROMAN EGYPT. Fully Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Milton, John, THE POEMS OF, BOTH ENGLISH AND LATIN, Compos'd at several times. Printed by his true Copies.
The Songs were set in Musick by Mr. HENRY LAWES, Gentleman of the Kings Chappel, and one of His Majesties Private Musick.
Printed and publish'd according to Order.
Printed by RUTH RAWORTH for HUMPHREY MOSELEY, and are to be sold at the signe of the Princes Armes in Pauls Churchyard, 1645.
See also Little Library and Methuen's Universal Library.
Minchin (H. C.), M.A. See Little Galleries.
Mitchell (P. Chalmers), M.A. OUTLINES OF BIOLOGY. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
A text-book designed to cover the Schedule issued by the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons.
'Moil (A.).' See Books on Business.
Moir (D. M.). See Little Library.
Moore (H. E.). See Social Questions Series.
Moran (Clarence G.). See Books on Business.
More (Sir Thomas). See Methuen's Universal Library.
Morfill (W. R.), Oriel College, Oxford. A HISTORY OF RUSSIA FROM PETER THE GREAT TO ALEXANDER II. With Maps and Plans. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Morich (R. J.), late of Cl'.ton College. See School Examination Series.
Morris (J. E.). See The Little Guides.
Morton (Miss Anderson). See Miss Brodrick.
Moule (H. C. G.), D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. See Leaders of Religion.
Muir (M. M. Pattison), M.A. THE CHEMISTRY OF FIRE. The Elementary Principles of Chemistry. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
Mundella (V. A.), M.A. See J. T. Dunn.
Munro (R.), LL.D. See The Antiquary's Books.
Naval Officer (A). See Illustrated Pocket Library.
Neal (W. G.). See R. N. Hall.
Newman (J. H.) and others. See Library of Devotion.
Nichols (J. B. B.). See Little Library.
Nicklin (T.), M. A. EXAMINATION PAPERS IN THUCYDIDES. *Crown 8vo. 2s.*
Nimrod. See Illustrated Pocket Library.
Northcote (James), R.A. THE CONVERSATIONS OF JAMES NORTHCOTE, R.A., AND JAMES WARD. Edited by ERNEST FLETCHER. With many Portraits. *Demy 8vo 10s. 6d.*
***Norway (A. H.)**, Author of 'Highways and Byways in Devon and Cornwall.' NAPLES. With 24 Coloured Illustrations by MAURICE GREIFFENHAGEN. A New Edition. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Novalis. THE DISCIPLES AT SAÏS AND OTHER FRAGMENTS. Edited by Miss UNA BIRCH. *Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Oliphant (Mrs.). See Leaders of Religion.
Oman (C. W. C.), M.A., Fellow of All Souls', Oxford. A HISTORY OF THE ART OF WAR. Vol. II.: The Middle Ages, from the Fourth to the Fourteenth Century. Illustrated. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d net.*
Ottley (R. L.), D.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology at Oxford and Canon of Christ Church. See Handbooks of Theology and Leaders of Religion.
Owen (Douglas), Barrister-at-Law, Secretary to the Alliance Marine and General Assurance Company. See Books on Business.
Oxford (M. N.), of Guy's Hospital. A HANDBOOK OF NURSING. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Pakes (W. C. C.). THE SCIENCE OF HYGIENE. With numerous Illustrations. *Demy* 8*vo.* 15*s.*

Palmer (Frederick). WITH KUROKI IN MANCHUPIA With many Illustrations. *Second Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Parker (Gilbert). A LOVER'S DIARY: SONGS IN SEQUENCE. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

Parkinson (John). PARADISI IN SOLE PARADISUS TERRISTRIS, OR A GARDEN OF ALL SORTS OF PLEASANT FLOWERS. *Folio.* £5, 5*s. net.*
Also an Edition of 20 copies on Japanese vellum. *Ten Guineas net.*

Parmenter (John). HELIO-TROPES, OR NEW POSIES FOR SUNDIALS, 1625. Edited by PERCIVAL LANDON. *Quarto.* 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

Parmentier (Prof. Léon). See Byzantine Texts.

Pascal. See Library of Devotion.

Paston (George). SOCIAL CARICATURES OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. *Imperial Quarto.* £2, 12*s.* 6*d. net.* See also Little Books on Art and Illustrated Pocket Library.

Paterson (W. R.) (Benjamin Swift). LIFE'S QUESTIONINGS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

Patterson (A. H.). NOTES OF AN EAST COAST NATURALIST. Illustrated in Colour by F. SOUTHGATE. *Second Edition. Cr.* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Peacock (N.). See Little Books on Art.

Pearce (E. H.), M.A. ANNALS OF CHRIST'S HOSPITAL. With many Illustrations. *Demy* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Peary (R. E.), Gold Medallist of the Royal Geographical Society. NORTHWARD OVER THE GREAT ICE. With over 800 Illustrations. 2 *vols. Royal* 8*vo.* 32*s. net.*

Peel (Sidney), late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, and Secretary to the Royal Commission on the Licensing Laws. PRACTICAL LICENSING REFORM. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

Peters (J. P.), D.D. See Churchman's Library.

Petrie (W. M. Flinders), D.C.L., LL.D., Professor of Egyptology at University College. A HISTORY OF EGYPT, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY Fully Illustrated. *In six volumes. Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s. each.*

VOL. I. PREHISTORIC TIMES TO XVITH DYNASTY. *Fifth Edition.*
VOL. II. THE XVIITH AND XVIIITH DYNASTIES. *Fourth Edition.*
VOL. III. XIXTH TO XXXTH DYNASTIES.
VOL. IV. THE EGYPT OF THE PTOLEMIES. J. P. MAHAFFY, Litt.D.
VOL. V. ROMAN EGYPT. J. G. MILNE, M.A.
VOL. VI. EGYPT IN THE MIDDLE AGES. STANLEY LANE-POOLE, M.A.

RELIGION AND CONSCIENCE IN ANCIENT EGYPT. Fully Illustrated. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

SYRIA AND EGYPT, FROM THE TELL EL AMARNA TABLETS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

EGYPTIAN TALES. Illustrated by TRISTRAM ELLIS. *In Two Volumes. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

EGYPTIAN DECORATIVE ART. With 120 Illustrations. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Phillips (W. A.). See Oxford Biographies.

Phillpotts (Eden). MY DEVON YEAR. With 38 Illustrations by J. LEY PETHYBRIDGE. *Second and Cheaper Edition. Large Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Pienaar (Philip). WITH STEYN AND DE WET. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Plautus. THE CAPTIVI. Edited, with an Introduction, Textual Notes, and a Commentary, by W. M. LINDSAY, Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. *Demy* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

Plowden-Wardlaw (J. T.), B.A., King's Coll. Camb. See School Examination Series.

Pocock (Roger). A FRONTIERSMAN. *Third Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Podmore (Frank). MODERN SPIRITUALISM. *Two Volumes. Demy* 8*vo.* 21*s. net.*
A History and a Criticism.

Poer (J. Patrick Le). A MODERN LEGIONARY. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Pollard (Alice). See Little Books on Art.

Pollard (A. W.). OLD PICTURE BOOKS. With many Illustrations. *Demy* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Pollard (Eliza F.). See Little Books on Art.

Pollock (David), M.I.N.A., Author of 'Modern Shipbuilding and the Men engaged in it,' etc., etc. See Books on Business.

Potter (M. C.), M.A., F.L.S. A TEXT-BOOK OF AGRICULTURAL BOTANY. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Potter Boy (An Old). WHEN I WAS A CHILD. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
Pradeau (G.). A KEY TO THE TIME ALLUSIONS IN THE DIVINE COMEDY. With a Dial. *Small quarto.* 3s. 6d.
Prance (G.). See R. Wyon.
Prescott (O. L.). ABOUT MUSIC, AND WHAT IT IS MADE OF. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d. *net.*
Price (L. L.), M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxon. A HISTORY OF ENGLISH POLITICAL ECONOMY. *Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.
Primrose (Deborah). A MODERN BŒOTIA. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
PROTECTION AND INDUSTRY. By various Writers. *Crown 8vo.* 1s. 6d. *net.*
Pugin and Rowlandson. THE MICROCOSM OF LONDON, OR LONDON IN MINIATURE. With 104 Illustrations in colour. *In Three Volumes. Small 4to.* £3, 3s. *net.*
'Q' (A. T. Quiller Couch). THE GOLDEN POMP. A Procession of English Lyrics. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d. *net.*
Quevedo Villegas. See Miniature Library.
G.R. and E. S. THE WOODHOUSE CORRESPONDENCE. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
Rackham (R. B.), M.A. See Westminster Commentaries.
Randolph (B. W.), D.D., Principal of the Theological College, Ely. See Library of Devotion.
Rannie (D. W.), M.A. A STUDENT'S HISTORY OF SCOTLAND. *Cr. 8vo.* 3s. 6d.
Rashdall (Hastings), M.A., Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. DOCTRINE AND DEVELOPMENT. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
Rawstorne (Lawrence, Esq.). See Illustrated Pocket Library.
A Real Paddy. See Illustrated Pocket Library.
Reason (W.), M.A. See Social Questions Series.
Redfern (W. B.), Author of 'Ancient Wood and Iron Work in Cambridge,' etc. ROYAL AND HISTORIC GLOVES AND ANCIENT SHOES. Profusely Illustrated in colour and half-tone. *Quarto,* £2, 2s. *net.*
Reynolds. See Little Galleries.
Roberts (M. E.). See C. C. Channer.
Robertson, (A.), D.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter. REGNUM DEI. The Bampton Lectures of 1901. *Demy 8vo.* 12s. 6d. *net.*
Robertson (C. Grant), M.A., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, Examiner in the Honour School of Modern History, Oxford, 1901-1904. SELECT STATUTES, CASES, AND CONSTITUTIONAL DOCUMENTS, 1660-1832. *Demy 8vo.* 10s. 6d. *net.*
***Robertson (Sir G. S.)** K.C.S.I. CHITRAL: The Story of a Minor Siege. With numerous Illustrations, Map and Plans. *Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d. *net.*
Robinson (A. W.), M.A. See Churchman's Bible.
Robinson (Cecilia). THE MINISTRY OF DEACONESSES. With an Introduction by the late Archbishop of Canterbury. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.
Rochefoucauld (La), See Little Library.
Rodwell (G.), B.A. NEW TESTAMENT GREEK. A Course for Beginners. With a Preface by WALTER LOCK, D.D., Warden of Keble College. *Fcap. 8vo.* 3s. 6d.
Roe (Fred). ANCIENT COFFERS AND CUPBOARDS: Their History and Description. With many Illustrations. *Quarto.* £3, 3s. *net.*
Rogers (A. G. L.), M.A., Editor of the last volume of 'The History of Agriculture and Prices in Engand.' See Books on Business.
Romney. See Little Galleries.
Roscoe (E. S.). ROBERT HARLEY, EARL OF OXFORD. Illustrated. *Demy 8vo.* 7s. 6d. This is the only life of Harley in existence.
See also The Little Guides.
Rose (Edward). THE ROSE READER. With numerous Illustrations. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d. *Also in 4 Parts. Parts I. and II.* 6d. *each; Part III.* 8d.; *Part IV.* 10d.
Rubie (A. E.), D.D, Head Master of College, Eltham. See Junior School Books.
Russell (W. Clark). THE LIFE OF ADMIRAL LORD COLLINGWOOD. With Illustrations by F. BRANGWYN. *Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6s.
A Colonial Edition is also published.
St. Anselm. See Library of Devotion.
St. Augustine. See Library of Devotion.
'Saki' (H. Munro). REGINALD. *Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo.* 2s. 6d. *net.*
Sales (St. Francis de). See Library of Devotion.
Salmon (A. L.). A POPULAR GUIDE TO DEVON. *Medium 8vo.* 6d. *net.* See also The Little Guides.
Sargeaunt (J.), M.A. ANNALS OF WESTMINSTER SCHOOL. With numerous Illustrations. *Demy 8vo.* 7s. 6d.
Sathas (C.). See Byzantine Texts.

Schmitt (John). See Byzantine Texts.

Scott (A. M.) WINSTON SPENCER CHURCHILL. With Portraits and Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Seeley (H. G.) F.R.S. DRAGONS OF THE AIR. With many Illustrations. *Cr. 8vo. 6s.*

***Selincourt (E. de).** M.A. THE POEMS OF JOHN KEATS. With an Introduction and Notes, and a Portrait in Photogravure. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Sells (V. P.). M.A. THE MECHANICS OF DAILY LIFE. Illustrated. *Cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Selous (Edmund). TOMMY SMITH'S ANIMALS. Illustrated by G. W. ORD. *Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Settle (J. H.). ANECDOTES OF SOLDIERS. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Shakespeare (William).
THE FOUR FOLIOS, 1623; 1632; 1664; 1685. Each *Four Guineas net*, or a complete set, *Twelve Guineas net.*

The Arden Shakespeare.
Demy 8vo. 2s. 6d. net each volume. General Editor, W. J. CRAIG. An Edition of Shakespeare in single Plays. Edited with a full Introduction, Textual Notes, and a Commentary at the foot of the page.
HAMLET. Edited by EDWARD DOWDEN, Litt.D.
ROMEO AND JULIET. Edited by EDWARD DOWDEN, Litt.D.
KING LEAR. Edited by W. J. CRAIG.
JULIUS CAESAR. Edited by M. MACMILLAN, M.A.
THE TEMPEST. Edited by MORETON LUCE.
OTHELLO. Edited by H. C. HART.
TITUS ANDRONICUS. Edited by H. B. BAILDON.
CYMBELINE. Edited by EDWARD DOWDEN.
THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR. Edited by H. C. HART.
A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM. Edited by H. CUNINGHAM.
KING HENRY V. Edited by H. A. EVANS.
ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL. Edited by W. O. BRIGSTOCKE.
THE TAMING OF THE SHREW. Edited by R. WARWICK BOND.
TIMON OF ATHENS. Edited by K. DEIGHTON.

The Little Quarto Shakespeare. Edited by W. J. CRAIG. With Introductions and Notes. *Pott 16mo. In 40 Volumes. Leather, price 1s. net each volume.*
See also Methuen's Universal Library.

Sharp (A.). VICTORIAN POETS. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Sharp (Mrs. E. A.). See Little Books on Art.

Shedlock (J. S.). THE PIANOFORTE SONATA: Its Origin and Development. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

Shelley (Percy B.). ADONAIS; an Elegy on the death of John Keats, Author of 'Endymion,' etc. Pisa. From the types of Didot, 1821. *2s. net.*
See also Methuen's Universal Library.

Sherwell (Arthur), M.A. See Social Questions Series.

***Shipley (Mary E.).** AN ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY FOR CHILDREN. With a Preface by the Bishop of Gibraltar, late Professor of Ecclesiastical History at King's College, London. With Maps and Illustrations. Part I. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.*

Sichel (Walter). DISRAELI: A Study in Personality and Ideas. With 3 Portraits. *Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.
See also Oxford Biographies.

Sime (J.). See Little Books on Art.

Simonson (G. A.). FRANCESCO GUARDI. With 41 Plates. *Royal folio. £2, 2s. net.*

Sketchley (R. E. D.). See Little Books on Art.

Skipton (H. P. K.). See Little Books on Art.

Sladen (Douglas). SICILY. With over 200 Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 5s. net.*

Small (Evan), M.A. THE EARTH. An Introduction to Physiography. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Smallwood (M. G.). See Little Books on Art.

Smedley (F. E.). See Illustrated Pocket Library.

Smith (Adam). THE WEALTH OF NATIONS. Edited with an Introduction and numerous Notes by EDWIN CANNAN, M.A. *Two volumes. Demy 8vo. 21s. net.*
See also Methuen's Universal Library.

Smith (Horace and James). See Little Library.

Snell (F. J.). A BOOK OF EXMOOR. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Sophocles. See Classical Translations.

Sornet (L. A.), Modern Language Master at King Edward School, Birmingham. See Junior School Books.

South (Wilton E.), M.A. See Junior School Books.

Southey (R.) ENGLISH SEAMEN. Edited, with an Introduction, by DAVID HANNAY.
Vol. I. (Howard, Clifford, Hawkins, Drake, Cavendish). *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*
Vol. II. (Richard Hawkins, Grenville, Essex, and Raleigh). *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Spence (C. H.), M.A., Clifton College. See School Examination Series.

Spooner (W. A.), M.A., Warden of New College, Oxford. See Leaders of Religion.

Stanbridge (J. W.), B.D., late Canon of York, and sometime Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. See Library of Devotion.

'Stancliffe.' GOLF DO'S AND DONT'S. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.*

Stedman (A. M. M.), M.A.
INITIA LATINA: Easy Lessons on Elementary Accidence. *Seventh Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.*
FIRST LATIN LESSONS. *Eighth Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.*
FIRST LATIN READER. With Notes adapted to the Shorter Latin Primer and Vocabulary. *Sixth Edition revised.* 18*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*
EASY SELECTIONS FROM CÆSAR. The Helvetian War. *Second Edition.* 18*mo.* 1*s.*
EASY SELECTIONS FROM LIVY. Part I. The Kings of Rome. 18*mo. Second Edition.* 1*s.* 6*d.*
EASY LATIN PASSAGES FOR UNSEEN TRANSLATION. *Tenth Edition Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*
EXEMPLA LATINA. First Exercises in Latin Accidence. With Vocabulary. *Third Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 1*s.*
EASY LATIN EXERCISES ON THE SYNTAX OF THE SHORTER AND REVISED LATIN PRIMER. With Vocabulary. *Ninth and Cheaper Edition, rewritten. Crown* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d. Original Edition.* 2*s.* 6*d.* KEY, 3*s. net.*
THE LATIN COMPOUND SENTENCE: Rules and Exercises. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.* With Vocabulary. 2*s.*
NOTANDA QUAEDAM: Miscellaneous Latin Exercises on Common Rules and Idioms. *Fourth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.* With Vocabulary. 2*s.* Key, 2*s. net.*
LATIN VOCABULARIES FOR REPETITION: Arranged according to Subjects. *Twelfth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*
A VOCABULARY OF LATIN IDIOMS. 18*mo. Second Edition.* 1*s.*
STEPS TO GREEK. *Second Edition, revised.* 18*mo.* 1*s.*
A SHORTER GREEK PRIMER. *Crown* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*
EASY GREEK PASSAGES FOR UNSEEN TRANSLATION. *Third Edition, revised. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*
GREEK VOCABULARIES FOR REPETITION. Arranged according to Subjects. *Third Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*
GREEK TESTAMENT SELECTIONS. For the use of Schools. With Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. *Third Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*
STEPS TO FRENCH. *Sixth Edition.* 18*mo.* 8*d.*
FIRST FRENCH LESSONS. *Sixth Edition, revised. Crown* 8*vo.* 1*s.*
EASY FRENCH PASSAGES FOR UNSEEN TRANSLATION. *Fifth Edition. revised. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*
EASY FRENCH EXERCISES ON ELEMENTARY SYNTAX. With Vocabulary. *Fourth Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.* KEY. 3*s. net.*
FRENCH VOCABULARIES FOR REPETITION: Arranged according to Subjects. *Twelfth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.*

Steel (R. Elliott), M.A., F.C.S. THE WORLD OF SCIENCE. Including Chemistry, Heat, Light, Sound, Magnetism, Electricity, Botany, Zoology, Physiology, Astronomy, and Geology. 147 Illustrations. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.* See also School Examination Series.

Stephenson (C.), of the Technical College, Bradford, and **Suddards (F.)** of the Yorkshire College, Leeds. ORNAMENTAL DESIGN FOR WOVEN FABRICS. Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo. Second Edition.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Stephenson (J.), M.A. THE CHIEF TRUTHS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Sterne (Laurence). See Little Library.

Sterry (W.), M.A. ANNALS OF ETON COLLEGE. With numerous Illustrations. *Demy* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Steuart (Katherine). BY ALLAN WATER. *Second Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Stevenson (R. L.). THE LETTERS OF ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON TO HIS FAMILY AND FRIENDS. Selected and Edited, with Notes and Introductions, by SIDNEY COLVIN. *Sixth and Cheaper Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 12*s.*

LIBRARY EDITION. *Demy 8vo. 2 vols. 25s. net.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

VAILIMA LETTERS. With an Etched Portrait by WILLIAM STRANG. *Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. Buckram. 6s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

THE LIFE OF R. L. STEVENSON. See G. Balfour.

Stevenson (M. I.). FROM SARANAC TO THE MARQUESAS. Being Letters written by Mrs. M. I. STEVENSON during 1887-8 to her sister, Miss JANE WHYTE BALFOUR. With an Introduction by GEORGE W. BALFOUR, M.D., LL.D., F.R.S.S. *Crown 8vo. 6s. net.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Stoddart (Anna M.). See Oxford Biographies.

Stone (E. D.), M.A., late Assistant Master at Eton. SELECTIONS FROM THE ODYSSEY. *Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

Stone (S. J.). POEMS AND HYMNS. With a Memoir by F. G. ELLERTON, M.A. With Portrait. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Straker (F.), Assoc. of the Institute of Bankers, and Lecturer to the London Chamber of Commerce. See Books on Business.

Streane (A. W.), D.D. See Churchman's Bible.

Stroud (H.), D.Sc., M.A., Professor of Physics in the Durham College of Science, Newcastle-on-Tyne. See Textbooks of Technology.

Strutt (Joseph). THE SPORTS AND PASTIMES OF THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND. Illustrated by many engravings. Revised by J. CHARLES COX, LL.D., F.S.A. *Quarto. 21s. net.*

Stuart (Capt. Donald). THE STRUGGLE FOR PERSIA. With a Map. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Sturch (F.), Manual Training Instructor to the Surrey County Council. SOLUTIONS TO THE CITY AND GUILDS QUESTIONS IN MANUAL INSTRUCTION DRAWING. *Imp. 4to. 2s.*

Suckling (Sir John). FRAGMENTA AUREA: a Collection of all the Incomparable Peeces, written by. And published by a friend to perpetuate his memory. Printed by his own copies.
Printed for HUMPHREY MOSELEY, and are to be sold at his shop, at the sign of the Princes Arms in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1646.

Suddards (F.). See C. Stephenson.

Surtees (R. S.). See Illustrated Pocket Library.

Swift (Jonathan). THE JOURNAL TO STELLA. Edited by G. A. AITKEN. *Cr. 8vo. 6s.*

Symes (J. E.), M.A. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Syrett (Netta). See Little Blue Books.

Tacitus. AGRICOLA. With Introduction, Notes, Map, etc. By R. F. DAVIS, M.A., late Assistant Master at Weymouth College. *Fcap. 8vo. 2s.*
GERMANIA. By the same Editor. *Fcap. 8vo. 2s.* See also Classical Translations.

Tauler (J.). See Library of Devotion.

Taunton (E. L.). A HISTORY OF THE JESUITS IN ENGLAND. With Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 21s. net.*

Taylor (A. E.). THE ELEMENTS OF METAPHYSICS. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*

Taylor (F. G.), M.A. See Commercial Series.

Taylor (I. A.). See Oxford Biographies.

Taylor (T. M.), M.A., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. A CONSTITUTIONAL AND POLITICAL HISTORY OF ROME. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Tennyson (Alfred, Lord). THE EARLY POEMS OF. Edited, with Notes and an Introduction, by J. CHURTON COLLINS, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
IN MEMORIAM, MAUD, AND THE PRINCESS. Edited by J. CHURTON COLLINS, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 6s.* See also Little Library.

Terry (C. S.). See Oxford Biographies.

Terton (Alice). LIGHTS AND SHADOWS IN A HOSPITAL. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Thackeray (W. M.). See Little Library.

Theobald (F. W.), M.A. INSECT LIFE. Illustrated. *Second Ed. Revised. Cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Thompson (A. H.). See The Little Guides.

Tileston (Mary W.). DAILY STRENGTH FOR DAILY NEEDS. *Tenth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.* Also editions in superior binding 5s. and 6s.

Tompkins (H. W.), F.R.H.S. See The Little Guides.

Townley (Lady Susan). MY CHINESE NOTE-BOOK With 16 Illustrations and 2 Maps. *Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.

Toynbee (Paget), M.A., D.Litt. DANTE STUDIES AND RESEARCHES. *Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.* See also Oxford Biographies.

Trench (Herbert). DEIRDRE WED: and Other Poems. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*
Trevelyan (G. M.), Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. ENGLAND UNDER THE STUARTS. With Maps and Plans. *Demy 8vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*
Troutbeck (G. E.). See The Little Guides.
Tuckwell (Gertrude). See Social Questions Series.
Twining (Louisa). See Social Questions Series.
Tyler (E. A.), B.A., F.C.S., Head of Chemical Department, Swansea Technical College. See Junior School Books.
Tyrell-Gill (Frances). See Little Books on Art.
Vaughan (Henry). See Little Library.
Voegelin (A.), M.A. See Junior Examination Series.
Wade (G. W.), D.D. OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. With Maps. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*
Wagner (Richard). See A. L. Cleather.
Wall (J. C.) DEVILS. Illustrated by the Author and from photographs. *Demy 8vo.* 4*s.* 6*d. net.* See also The Antiquary's Books.
Walters (H. B.). See Little Books on Art.
Walton (Izaac) and Cotton (Charles). See Illustrated Pocket Library, Methuen's Universal Library, and Little Library.
Warmelo (D. S. Van). ON COMMANDO. With Portrait. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
Waterhouse (Mrs. Alfred). WITH THE SIMPLE-HEARTED: Little Homiliesto Women in Country Places. *Small Pott 8vo.* 2*s. net.* See also Little Library.
Weatherhead (T. C.), M.A. EXAMINATION PAPERS IN HORACE. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* See also Junior Examination Series.
Webb (W. T.). See Little Blue Books.
Webber (F. C.). See Textbooks of Technology.
Wells (Sidney H.). See Textbooks of Technology.
Wells (J.), M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Wadham College. OXFORD AND OXFORD LIFE. By Members of the University. *Third Edition Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
A SHORT HISTORY OF ROME. *Fifth Edition.* With 3 Maps. *Cr. 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
This book is intended for the Middle and Upper Forms of Public Schools and for Pass Students at the Universities. It contains copious Tables, etc. See also TheLittle Guides.
Wetmore (Helen C.). THE LAST OF THE GREAT SCOUTS ('Buffalo Bill'). With Illustrations. *Second Edition. Demy 8vo.* 6*s.*
Whibley (C.). See Henley and Whibley.
Whibley (L.), M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge. GREEK OLIGARCHIES: THEIR ORGANISATION AND CHARACTER. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*
Whitaker (G. H.), M.A. See Churchman's Bible.
White (Gilbert). THE NATURAL HISTORY OF SELBORNE. Edited by L. C. MIALL, F.R.S., assisted by W. WARDE FOWLER, M.A. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.* See also Methuen's Universal Library.
Whitfield (E. E.). See Commercial Series.
Whitehead (A. W.). GASPARD DE COLIGNY. With many Illustrations. *Demy 8vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*
Whitley (Miss). See Social Questions Series.
Whyte (A. G.), B.Sc., Editor of *Electrical Investments.* See Books on Business.
Wilberforce (Wilfrid) See Little Books on Art.
Wilde (Oscar). DE PROFUNDIS. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s. net.*
Also a Limited Edition on Japanese Vellum. *Demy 8vo.* £2, 2*s. net*; and a Limited Edition on hand-made paper. *Demy 8vo.* 21*s. net.* A Colonial Edition is also published.
Wilkins (W. H.), B.A. See Social Questions Series.
Wilkinson (J. Frome). See Social Questions Series.
Williamson (W.). THE BRITISH GARDENER. Illustrated. *Demy 8vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*
Williamson (W.), B.A. EASY DICTATION AND SPELLING. *Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo.* 1*s.* See also Junior Examination Series and Junior School Books.
Wilmot-Buxton (E. M.). MAKERS OF EUROPE. *Crown 8vo. Third Edition.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
A Text-book of European History for Middle Forms.
THE ANCIENT WORLD. With Maps and Illustrations. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
See also The Beginner's Books.
Wilson (Bishop). See Library of Devotion.
Willson (Beckles). LORD STRATHCONA: the Story of his Life. Illustrated. *Demy 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.
Wilson (A. J.), Editor of the *Investor's Review,* City Editor of the *Daily Chronicle.* See Books on Business.
Wilson (H. A.). See Books on Business.

Wilton (Richard), M.A. LYRA PASTORALIS: Songs of Nature, Church, and Home. *Pott 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
A volume of devotional poems.
Winbolt (S. E.), M.A., Assistant Master in Christ's Hospital. EXERCISES IN LATIN ACCIDENCE. *Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.*
An elementary book adapted for Lower Forms to accompany the Shorter Latin Primer.
LATIN HEXAMETER VERSE: An Aid to Composition. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.* KEY, *5s. net.*
Windle (B. C. A.), D.Sc., F.R.S. See Antiquary's Books and The Little Guides.
Winterbotham (Canon), M.A., B.Sc., LL.B. See Churchman's Library.
Wood (J. A. E.). See Textbooks of Technology.
Wordsworth (Christopher). See Antiquary's Books.
Wordsworth (W.). See Little Library.
Wordsworth (W.) and **Coleridge (S. T.)**. See Little Library.
Wright (Arthur), M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge. See Churchman's Library.
Wright (Sophie). GERMAN VOCABULARIES FOR REPETITION. *Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.*
***Wrong (George M.)**, Professor of History in the University of Toronto. THE EARL OF ELGIN. With Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*
Wylde (A. B.). MODERN ABYSSINIA. With a Map and a Portrait. *Demy 8vo. 15s. net.*
Wyndham (G.), M.P. THE POEMS OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. With an Introduction and Notes. *Demy 8vo. Buckram, gilt top. 10s. 6d.*
Wyon (R.) and Prance (G.). THE LAND OF THE BLACK MOUNTAIN. Being a description of Montenegro. With 40 Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
A Colonial Edition is also published.
Yeats (W. B.). AN ANTHOLOGY OF IRISH VERSE. *Revised and Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Yendis (M.). THE GREAT RED FROG. A Story told in 40 Coloured Pictures. *Fcap. 8vo. 1s. net.*
Young (Filson). THE COMPLETE MOTORIST. With 138 Illustrations. *Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*
Young (T. M.). THE AMERICAN COTTON INDUSTRY: A Study of Work and Workers. With an Introduction by ELIJAH HELM, Secretary to the Manchester Chamber of Commerce. *Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; paper boards, 1s. 6d.*
Zenker (E. V.). ANARCHISM. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.*
Zimmern (Antonia). WHAT DO WE KNOW CONCERNING ELECTRICITY? *Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d. net.*

Antiquary's Books, The

General Editor, J. CHARLES COX, LL.D., F.S.A.

A series of volumes dealing with various branches of English Antiquities; comprehensive and popular, as well as accurate and scholarly.

ENGLISH MONASTIC LIFE. By the Right Rev. Abbot Gasquet, O.S.B. Illustrated. *Second Edition, revised. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*
REMAINS OF THE PREHISTORIC AGE IN ENGLAND. By B. C. A. Windle, D.Sc., F.R.S. With numerous Illustrations and Plans. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*
OLD SERVICE BOOKS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH. By Christopher Wordsworth, M.A., and Henry Littlehales. With Coloured and other Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*
CELTIC ART. By J. Romilly Allen, F.S.A. With numerous Illustrations and Plans. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*
*ARCHÆOLOGY AND FALSE ANTIQUITIES. By R. Munro, LL.D. With numerous Illustrations. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*
SHRINES OF BRITISH SAINTS. By J. C. WALL. With numerous Illustrations and Plans. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Beginner's Books, The

*EASY FRENCH RHYMES. By Henri Blouet. Illustrated. *Fcap. 8vo. 1s.*
*EASY STORIES FROM ENGLISH HISTORY. By E. M. Wilmot-Buxton, Author of 'Makers of Europe.' *Fcap. 8vo. 1s.*

Business, Books on

Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

A series of volumes dealing with all the most important aspects of commercial and financial activity. The volumes are intended to treat separately all the considerable

industries and forms of business, and to explain accurately and clearly what they do and how they do it. The first Twelve volumes are—

PORTS AND DOCKS. By Douglas Owen.
RAILWAYS. By E. R. McDermott.
THE STOCK EXCHANGE. By Chas. Duguid. *Second Edition.*
THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE. By A. J. Wilson.
THE ELECTRICAL INDUSTRY: LIGHTING, TRACTION, AND POWER. By A. G. Whyte, B.Sc.
THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY. By David Pollock, M.I.N.A.
THE MONEY MARKET. By F. Straker.
THE BUSINESS SIDE OF AGRICULTURE. By A. G. L. Rogers, M.A.
LAW IN BUSINESS. By H. A. Wilson.
THE BREWING INDUSTRY. By Julian L. Baker, F.I.C., F.C.S.
THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY. By G. de H. Stone.
MINING AND MINING INVESTMENTS. By 'A. Moil.'
*THE BUSINESS OF ADVERTISING. By Clarence G. Moran, Bar.ister-at-Law. Illustrated.
*TRADE UNIONS. By G. Drage.
*CIVIL ENGINEERING. By T. Claxton Fidler, M.Inst. C.E. Illustrated.
*THE COAL INDUSTRY. By Ernest Aves. Illustrated.

Byzantine Texts

Edited by J. B. BURY, M.A., Litt.D.

A series of texts of Byzantine Historians, edited by English and foreign scholars.

ZACHARIAH OF MITYLENE. Translated by F. J. Hamilton, D.D., and E. W. Brooks. *Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*
EVAGRIUS. Edited by Léon Parmentier and M. Bidez. *Demy 8vo.* 10*s. 6d. net.*
THE HISTORY OF PSELLUS. Edited by C. Sathas. *Demy 8vo.* 15*s. net.*
ECTHESIS CHRONICA. Edited by Professor Lambros. *Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*
THE CHRONICLE OF MOREA. Edited by John Schmitt. *Demy 8vo.* 15*s. net.*

Churchman's Bible, The

General Editor, J. H. BURN, B.D., F.R.S.E.

A series of Expositions on the Books of the Bible, which will be of service to the general reader in the practical and devotional study of the Sacred Text.

Each Book is provided with a full and clear Introductory Section, in which is stated what is known or conjectured respecting the date and occasion of the composition of the Book, and any other particulars that may help to elucidate its meaning as a whole. The Exposition is divided into sections of a convenient length, corresponding as far as possible with the divisions of the Church Lectionary. The Translation of the Authorised Version is printed in full, such corrections as are deemed necessary being placed in footnotes.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. Edited by A. W. Robinson, M.A. *Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo.* 1*s. 6d. net.*
ECCLESIASTES. Edited by A. W. Streane, D.D. *Fcap. 8vo.* 1*s. 6d. net.*
THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS. Edited by C. R. D. Biggs, D.D. *Fcap 8vo.* 1*s. 6d. net.*
THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES. Edited by H. W. Fulford, M.A. *Fcap. 8vo* 1*s. 6d. net.*
ISAIAH. Edited by W. E. Barnes, D.D. *Two Volumes. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. net each.* With Map.
THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. Edited by G. H. Whitaker, M.A. *Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d. net.*

Churchman's Library, The

General Editor, J. H. BURN, B.D., F.R.S.E.,

A series of volumes upon such questions as are occupying the attention of Church people at the present time. The Editor has enlisted the services of a band of scholars, who, having made a special study of their respective subjects, are in a position to furnish the best results of modern research accurately and attractively.

THE BEGINNINGS OF ENGLISH CHRISTIANITY. By W. E. Collins, M.A. With Map. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
SOME NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS. By Arthur Wright, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN HERE AND HEREAFTER. By Canon Winterbotham, M.A., B.Sc., LL.B. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.
THE WORKMANSHIP OF THE PRAYER BOOK: Its Literary and Liturgical Aspects. By J. Dowden, D.D. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.
EVOLUTION. By F. B. Jevons, M.A., Litt.D. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.
THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE NEW SCHOLARSHIP. By J. W. Peters, D.D. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
THE CHURCHMAN'S INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. By A. M. Mackay, B.A. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.
THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. By E. T. Green, M.A. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY. By J. A. MacCulloch. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Classical Translations

Edited by H. F. FOX, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose College, Oxford.

Crown 8vo.

A series of Translations from the Greek and Latin Classics. The Publishers have enlisted the services of some of the best Oxford and Cambridge Scholars, and it is their intention that the series shall be distinguished by literary excellence as well as by scholarly accuracy.

ÆSCHYLUS—Agamemnon, Choephoroe, Eumenides. Translated by Lewis Campbell, LL.D. 5s.
CICERO—De Oratore I. Translated by E. N. P. Moor, M.A. 3s. 6d.
CICERO—Select Orations (Pro Milone, Pro Mureno, Philippic II., in Catilinam). Translated by H. E. D. BLAKISTON, M.A. 5s.
CICERO—De Natura Deorum. Translated by F. Brooks, M.A. 3s. 6d.
CICERO—De Officiis. Translated by G. B. Gardiner, M.A. 2s. 6d.
HORACE—The Odes and Epodes. Translated by A. D. Godley, M.A. 2s.
LUCIAN—Six Dialogues (Nigrinus, Icaro-Menippus, The Cock, The Ship, The Parasite, The Lover of Falsehood). Translated by S. T. Irwin, M.A. 3s. 6d.
SOPHOCLES—Electra and Ajax. Translated by E. D. A. Morshead, M.A. 2s. 6d.
TACITUS—Agricola and Germania. Translated by R. B. Townshend. 2s. 6d.
THE SATIRES OF JUVENAL. Translated by S. G. Owen. 2s. 6d.

Commercial Series, Methuen's

Edited by H. DE B. GIBBINS, Litt.D., M.A.

Crown 8vo.

A series intended to assist students and young men preparing for a commercial career, by supplying useful handbooks of a clear and practical character, dealing with those subjects which are absolutely essential in the business life.

COMMERCIAL EDUCATION IN THEORY AND PRACTICE. By E. E. Whitfield, M.A. 5s.
An introduction to Methuen's Commercial Series treating the question of Commercial Education fully from both the point of view of the teacher and of the parent.
BRITISH COMMERCE AND COLONIES FROM ELIZABETH TO VICTORIA. By H. de B. Gibbins, Litt.D., M.A. *Third Edition.* 2s.
COMMERCIAL EXAMINATION PAPERS. By H. de B. Gibbins, Litt.D., M.A. 1s. 6d.
THE ECONOMICS OF COMMERCE. By H. de B. Gibbins, Litt.D., M.A. 1s. 6d.
A GERMAN COMMERCIAL READER. By S. E. Bally. With Vocabulary. 2s.
A COMMERCIAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE. By L. W. Lyde, M.A. *Fourth Edition.* 2s.
A COMMERCIAL GEOGRAPHY OF FOREIGN NATIONS. By F. C. Boon, B.A. 2s.
A PRIMER OF BUSINESS. By S. Jackson, M.A. *Third Edition.* 1s. 6d.
COMMERCIAL ARITHMETIC. By F. G. Taylor, M.A. *Third Edition.* 1s. 6d.
FRENCH COMMERCIAL CORRESPONDENCE. By S. E. Bally. With Vocabulary. *Third Edition.* 2s.
GERMAN COMMERCIAL CORRESPONDENCE. By S. E. Bally. With Vocabulary. 2s. 6d.
A FRENCH COMMERCIAL READER. By S. E. Bally. With Vocabulary. *Second Edition.* 2s.
PRECIS WRITING AND OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE. By E. E. Whitfield, M.A. *Second Edition.* 2s.
A GUIDE TO PROFESSIONS AND BUSINESS. By H. Jones. 1s. 6d.
THE PRINCIPLES OF BOOK-KEEPING BY DOUBLE ENTRY. By J. E. B. M'Allen, M.A. 2s.
COMMERCIAL LAW. By W. Douglas Edwards. 2s.

Connoisseur's Library, The

Wide Royal 8vo. 25*s. net.*

A sumptuous series of 20 books on art, written by experts for collectors, superbly illustrated in photogravure, collotype, and colour. The technical side of the art is duly treated. The first volumes are—

MEZZOTINTS. By Cyril Davenport. With 40 Plates in Photogravure.
PORCELAIN. By Edward Dillon. With 19 Plates in Colour, 20 in Collotype, and 5 in Photogravure.
*MINIATURES. By Dudley Heath. With 9 Plates in Colour, 15 in Collotype, and 15 in Photogravure.
*IVORIES. By A. Maskell. With 80 Plates in Collotype and Photogravure.

Devotion, The Library of

With Introductions and (where necessary) Notes.

Small Pott 8vo, cloth, 2s.; leather, 2s. 6d. net.

The masterpieces of devotional literature. The books are furnished with such Introductions and Notes as may be necessary to explain the standpoint of the author and the obvious difficulties of the text, without unnecessary intrusion between the author and the devout mind.

THE CONFESSIONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE. Edited by C. Bigg, D.D. *Third Edition.*
THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. Edited by Walter Lock, D.D. *Second Edition.*
THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. Edited by C. Bigg, D.D. *Fourth Edition.*
A BOOK OF DEVOTIONS. Edited by J. W. Stanbridge, B.D. *Second Edition.*
LYRA INNOCENTIUM. Edited by Walter Lock, D.D.
A SERIOUS CALL TO A DEVOUT AND HOLY LIFE. Edited by C. Bigg, D.D. *Second Edition.*
THE TEMPLE. Edited by E. C. S. Gibson, D.D.
A GUIDE TO ETERNITY. Edited by J. W. Stanbridge, B.D.
THE PSALMS OF DAVID. Edited by B. W. Randolph, D.D.
LYRA APOSTOLICA. Edited by Canon Scott Holland and Canon H. C. Beeching, M.A.
THE INNER WAY. By J. Tauler. Edited by A. W. Hutton, M.A.
THE THOUGHTS OF PASCAL. Edited by C. S. Jerram, M.A.
ON THE LOVE OF GOD. By St. Francis de Sales. Edited by W. J. Knox-Little, M.A.
A MANUAL OF CONSOLATION FROM THE SAINTS AND FATHERS. Edited by J. H. Burn, B.D.
THE SONG OF SONGS. Edited by B. Blaxland, M.A.
THE DEVOTIONS OF ST. ANSELM. Edited by C. C. J. Webb, M.A.
GRACE ABOUNDING. By John Bunyan. Edited by S. C. Freer, M.A.
BISHOP WILSON'S SACRA PRIVATA. Edited by A. E. Burn, B.D.
LYRA SACRA: A Book of Sacred Verse. Edited by H. C. Beeching, M.A, Canon of Westminster.
A DAY BOOK FROM THE SAINTS AND FATHERS. Edited by J. H. Burn, B.D.
HEAVENLY WISDOM. A Selection from the English Mystics. Edited by E. C. Gregory.
LIGHT, LIFE, and LOVE. A Selection from the German Mystics. Edited by W. R. Inge, M.A.

Illustrated Pocket Library of Plain and Coloured Books, The

Fcap 8vo. 3*s. 6d. net each volume.*

A series, in small form, of some of the famous illustrated books of fiction and general literature. These are faithfully reprinted from the first or best editions without introduction or notes.

COLOURED BOOKS

OLD COLOURED BOOKS. By George Paston. With 16 Coloured Plates. *Fcap. 8vo.* 2*s. net.*
THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JOHN MYTTON, ESQ. By Nimrod. With 18 Coloured Plates by Henry Alken and T. J. Rawlins. *Third Edition.* 3*s. 6d. net.*
Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30*s. net.*
THE LIFE OF A SPORTSMAN. By Nimrod. With 35 Coloured Plates by Henry Alken. 3*s. 6d. net.*
Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30*s. net.*
HANDLEY CROSS. By R. S. SURTEES. With 17 Coloured Plates and 100 Woodcuts in the Text by John Leech. 3*s. 6d. net.*
Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30*s. net.*
MR. SPONGE'S SPORTING TOUR. By R. S. Surtees. With 13 Coloured Plates and 90 Woodcuts in the Text by John Leech. 3*s. 6d. net.*
Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30*s. net.*

JORROCKS' JAUNTS AND JOLLITIES. By R. S. Surtees. With 15 Coloured Plates by H. Alken. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30s. *net.*

This volume is reprinted from the extremely rare and costly edition of 1843, which contains Alken's very fine illustrations instead of the usual ones by Phiz.

ASK MAMMA. By R. S. Surtees. With 13 Coloured Plates and 70 Woodcuts in the Text by John Leech. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30s. *net.*

THE ANALYSIS OF THE HUNTING FIELD. By R. S. Surtees. With 7 Coloured Plates by Henry Alken, and 43 Illustrations on Wood. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE TOUR OF DR. SYNTAX IN SEARCH OF THE PICTURESQUE. By William Combe. With 30 Coloured Plates by T. Rowlandson. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30s. *net.*

THE TOUR OF DOCTOR SYNTAX IN SEARCH OF CONSOLATION. By William Combe. With 24 Coloured Plates by T. Rowlandson. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30s. *net.*

THE THIRD TOUR OF DOCTOR SYNTAX IN SEARCH OF A WIFE. By William Combe. With 24 Coloured Plates by T. Rowlandson. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30s. *net.*

THE HISTORY OF JOHNNY QUAE GENUS: the Little Foundling of the late Dr. Syntax. By the Author of 'The Three Tours.' With 24 Coloured Plates by Rowlandson. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30s. *net.*

THE ENGLISH DANCE OF DEATH, from the Designs of T. Rowlandson, with Metrical Illustrations by the Author of 'Doctor Syntax.' *Two Volumes.* 7s. *net.*

This book contains 76 Coloured Plates.

Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30s. *net.*

THE DANCE OF LIFE: A Poem. By the Author of 'Doctor Syntax.' Illustrated with 26 Coloured Engravings by T. Rowlandson. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30s. *net.*

LIFE IN LONDON: or, the Day and Night Scenes of Jerry Hawthorn, Esq., and his Elegant Friend, Corinthian Tom. By Pierce Egan. With 36 Coloured Plates by I. R. and G. Cruikshank. With numerous Designs on Wood. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30s. *net.*

*REAL LIFE IN LONDON: or, the Rambles and Adventures of Bob Tallyho, Esq., and his Cousin, The Hon. Tom Dashall. By an Amateur (Pierce Egan). With 31 Coloured Plates by Alken and Rowlandson, etc. *Two Volumes.* 7s. *net.*

THE LIFE OF AN ACTOR. By Pierce Egan. With 27 Coloured Plates by Theodore Lane, and several Designs on Wood. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE VICAR OF WAKEFIELD. By Oliver Goldsmith. With 24 Coloured Plates by T. Rowlandson. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Also a limited edition on large Japenese paper. 30s. *net.*

A reproduction of a very rare book.

THE MILITARY ADVENTURES OF JOHNNY NEWCOME. By an Officer. With 15 Coloured Plates by T. Rowlandson. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE NATIONAL SPORTS OF GREAT BRITAIN. With Descriptions and 51 Coloured Plates by Henry Alken. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper. 30s. *net.*

This book is completely different from the large folio edition of 'National Sports' by the same artist, and none of the plates are similar.

THE ADVENTURES OF A POST CAPTAIN. By A Naval Officer. With 24 Coloured Plates by Mr. Williams. 3s. 6d. *net.*

GAMONIA: or, the Art of Preserving Game; and an Improved Method of making Plantations and Covers, explained and illustrated by Lawrence Rawstorne, Esq. With 15 Coloured Plates by T. Rawlins. 3s. 6d. *net.*

AN ACADEMY FOR GROWN HORSEMEN: Containing the completest Instructions for Walking, Trotting, Cantering, Galloping, Stumbling, and Tumbling. Illustrated with 27 Coloured Plates, and adorned with a Portrait of the Author. By Geoffrey Gambado, Esq. 3s. 6d. *net.*

REAL LIFE IN IRELAND, or, the Day and Night Scenes of Brian Boru, Esq., and his Elegant Friend, Sir Shawn O'Dogherty. By a Real Paddy. With 19 Coloured Plates by Heath, Marks, etc. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE ADVENTURES OF JOHNNY NEWCOME IN THE NAVY. By Alfred Burton. With 16 Coloured Plates by T. Rowlandson 3s. 6d. *net.*

*THE OLD ENGLISH SQUIRE: A Poem. By John Careless, Esq. With 20 Coloured Plates after the style of T. Rowlandson.

PLAIN BOOKS

THE GRAVE: A Poem. By Robert Blair. Illustrated by 12 Etchings executed by Louis Schiavonetti from the original Inventions of William Blake. With an Engraved Title Page and a Portrait of Blake by T. Phillips, R.A. *3s. 6d. net.*

The illustrations are reproduced in photogravure. Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper, with India proofs and a duplicate set of the plates. *15s. net.*

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE BOOK OF JOB. Invented and engraved by William Blake. *3s. 6d. net.*

These famous Illustrations—21 in number—are reproduced in photogravure. Also a limited edition on large Japanese paper, with India proofs and a duplicate set of the plates. *15s. net.*

ÆSOP'S FABLES. With 380 Woodcuts by Thomas Bewick. *3s. 6d. net.*

WINDSOR CASTLE. By W. Harrison Ainsworth. With 22 Plates and 87 Woodcuts in the Text by George Cruikshank. *3s. 6d. net.*

THE TOWER OF LONDON. By W. Harrison Ainsworth. With 40 Plates and 58 Woodcuts in the Text by George Cruikshank. *3s. 6d. net.*

FRANK FAIRLEGH. By F. E. Smedley. With 30 Plates by George Cruikshank. *3s. 6d. net.*

HANDY ANDY. By Samuel Lover. With 24 Illustrations by the Author. *3s. 6d. net.*

THE COMPLEAT ANGLER. By Izaak Walton and Charles Cotton. With 14 Plates and 77 Woodcuts in the Text. *3s. 6d. net.*

This volume is reproduced from the beautiful edition of John Major of 1824.

THE PICKWICK PAPERS. By Charles Dickens. With the 43 Illustrations by Seymour and Phiz, the two Buss Plates, and the 32 Contemporary Onwhyn Plates. *3s. 6d. net.*

Junior Examination Series

Edited by A. M. M. STEDMAN, M.A. *Fcap. 8vo. 1s.*

This series is intended to lead up to the School Examination Series, and is intended for the use of teachers and students, to supply material for the former and practice for the latter. The papers are carefully graduated, cover the whole of the subject usually taught, and are intended to form part of the ordinary class work. They may be used *vivâ voce* or as a written examination.

JUNIOR FRENCH EXAMINATION PAPERS. By F. Jacob, M.A.
JUNIOR LATIN EXAMINATION PAPERS. By C. G. Botting, M.A. *Third Edition.*
JUNIOR ENGLISH EXAMINATION PAPERS. By W. Williamson, M.A.
JUNIOR ARITHMETIC EXAMINATION PAPERS. By W. S. Beard. *Second Edition.*
JUNIOR ALGEBRA EXAMINATION PAPERS. By S. W. Finn, M.A.
JUNIOR GREEK EXAMINATION PAPERS. By T. C. Weatherhead, M.A.
JUNIOR GENERAL INFORMATION EXAMINATION PAPERS. By W. S. Beard.
JUNIOR GEOGRAPHY EXAMINATION PAPERS. By W. G. Baker, M.A.
JUNIOR GERMAN EXAMINATION PAPERS. By A. Voegelin, M.A.

Junior School-Books, Methuen's

Edited by O. D. INSKIP, LL.D., and W. WILLIAMSON, B.A.

A series of elementary books for pupils in lower forms, simply written by teachers of experience.

A CLASS-BOOK OF DICTATION PASSAGES. By W. Williamson, B.A. *Tenth Edition. Cr. 8vo. 1s. 6d.*
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW. Edited by E. Wilton South, M.A. With Three Maps. *Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.*
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK. Edited by A. E. Rubie, D.D. With Three Maps. *Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.*
A JUNIOR ENGLISH GRAMMAR. By W. Williamson, B.A. With numerous passages for parsing and analysis, and a chapter on Essay Writing. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s.*
A JUNIOR CHEMISTRY. By E. A. Tyler, B.A., F.C.S. With 73 Illustrations. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Edited by A. E. Rubie, D.D. *Crown 8vo. 2s.*
A JUNIOR FRENCH GRAMMAR. By L. A. Sornet and M. J. Acatos. *Crown 8vo. 2s.*
ELEMENTARY EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCE. PHYSICS by W. T. Clough, A.R.C.S. CHEMISTRY by A. E. Dunstan, B.Sc. With 2 Plates and 154 Diagrams. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
A JUNIOR GEOMETRY. By Noel S. Lydon. With 239 Diagrams. *Crown 8vo. 2s.*
*A JUNIOR MAGNETISM AND ELECTRICITY. By W. T. CLOUGH. With many Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*
*ELEMENTARY EXPERIMENTAL CHEMISTRY. By A. E. Dunstan, B.Sc. With many Illustrations. *Crown 8vo. 2s.*
*A JUNIOR FRENCH PROSE. By R. R. N. Baron, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 2s.*
*THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE. With an Introduction and Notes by William Williamson, B.A. With Three Maps. *Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

Leaders of Religion

Edited by H. C. BEECHING, M.A., Canon of Westminster. *With Portraits.*

Crown 8vo. 2s. net.

A series of short biographies of the most prominent leaders of religious life and thought of all ages and countries.

CARDINAL NEWMAN. By R. H. Hutton.
JOHN WESLEY. By J. H. Overton, M.A.
BISHOP WILBERFORCE. By G. W. Daniell, M.A.
CARDINAL MANNING. By A. W. Hutton, M.A.
CHARLES SIMEON. By H. C. G. Moule, D.D.
JOHN KEBLE. By Walter Lock, D.D.
THOMAS CHALMERS. By Mrs. Oliphant.
LANCELOT ANDREWES. By R. L. Ottley, D.D. *Second Edition.*
AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY. By E. L. Cutts, D.D.
WILLIAM LAUD. By W. H. Hutton, M.A. *Second Edition.*
JOHN KNOX. By F. MacCunn. *Second Edition.*
JOHN HOWE. By R. F. Horton, D.D.
BISHOP KEN. By F. A. Clarke, M.A.
GEORGE FOX, THE QUAKER. By T. Hodgkin, D.C.L.
JOHN DONNE. By Augustus Jessopp, D.D.
THOMAS CRANMER. By A. J. Mason, D.D.
BISHOP LATIMER. By R. M. Carlyle and A. J. Carlyle, M.A.
BISHOP BUTLER. By W. A. Spooner, M.A.

Little Blue Books, The

General Editor, E. V. LUCAS.

Illustrated. Demy 16mo. 2s. 6d.

A series of books for children. The aim of the editor is to get entertaining or exciting stories about normal children, the moral of which is implied rather than expressed.

1. THE CASTAWAYS OF MEADOWBANK. By Thomas Cobb.
2. THE BEECHNUT BOOK. By Jacob Abbott. Edited by E. V. Lucas.
3. THE AIR GUN. By T. Hilbert.
4. A SCHOOL YEAR. By Netta Syrett.
5. THE PEELES AT THE CAPITAL. By Roger Ashton.
6. THE TREASURE OF PRINCEGATE PRIORY. By T. Cobb.
7. MRS. BARBERRY'S GENERAL SHOP. By Roger Ashton.
8. A BOOK OF BAD CHILDREN. By W. T. Webb.
9. THE LOST BALL. By Thomas Cobb.

Little Books on Art

With many Illustrations. Demy 16mo. 2s. 6d. net.

A series of monographs in miniature, containing the complete outline of the subject under treatment and rejecting minute details. These books are produced with the greatest care. Each volume consists of about 200 pages, and contains from 30 to 40 illustrations, including a frontispiece in photogravure.

GREEK ART. H. B. Walters.
BOOKPLATES. E. Almack.
REYNOLDS. J. Sime.
ROMNEY. George Paston.
WATTS. Miss R. E. D. Sketchley.
LEIGHTON. Alice Corkran.
VELASQUEZ. Wilfrid Wilberforce and A. R. Gilbert.
GREUZE AND BOUCHER. Eliza F. Pollard.
VANDYCK. M. G. Smallwood.
TURNER. F. Tyrell-Gill.
DÜRER. Jessie Allen.
HOPPNER. H. P. K. Skipton.
HOLBEIN. Mrs. G. Fortescue.
BURNE-JONES. Fortunée de Lisle.
REMBRANDT. Mrs. E. A. Sharp
COROT. Alice Pollard and Ethel Birnstingl.
MILLET. Netta Peacock.
*RAPHAEL. A. R. Dryhurst.
*ILLUMINATED MSS. J. W. Bradley.

Little Galleries, The

Demy 16mo. 2s. 6d. net.

A series of little books containing examples of the best work of the great painters. Each volume contains 20 plates in photogravure, together with a short outline of the life and work of the master to whom the book is devoted.

A LITTLE GALLERY OF REYNOLDS.
A LITTLE GALLERY OF ROMNEY.
A LITTLE GALLERY OF HOPPNER.
A LITTLE GALLERY OF MILLAIS.
A LITTLE GALLERY OF ENGLISH POETS.

Little Guides, The

Small Pott 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d. net.; leather, 3s. 6d. net.

OXFORD AND ITS COLLEGES. By J. Wells, M.A. Illustrated by E. H. New. *Fourth Edition.*
CAMBRIDGE AND ITS COLLEGES. By A. Hamilton Thompson. *Second Edition.* Illustrated by E. H. New.
THE MALVERN COUNTRY. By B. C. A. Windle, D.Sc., F.R.S. Illustrated by E. H. New.
SHAKESPEARE'S COUNTRY. By B. C. A. Windle, D.Sc., F.R.S. Illustrated by E. H. New. *Second Edition.*
SUSSEX. By F. G. Brabant, M.A. Illustrated by E. H. New.
WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By G. E. Troutbeck. Illustrated by F. D. Bedford.
NORFOLK. By W A. Dutt. Illustrated by B. C. Boulter.
CORNWALL. By A. L. Salmon. Illustrated by B. C. Boulter.
BRITTANY. By S. Baring-Gould. Illustrated by J. Wylie.
HERTFORDSHIRE. By H. W. Tompkins, F.R.H.S. Illustrated by E. H. New.
THE ENGLISH LAKES. By F. G. Brabant, M.A. Illustrated by E. H. New.
KENT. By G. Clinch. Illustrated by F. D. Bedford.
ROME By C. G. Ellaby. Illustrated by B. C. Boulter.
THE ISLE OF WIGHT. By G. Clinch. Illustrated by F. D. Bedford.
SURREY. By F. A. H. Lambert. Illustrated by E. H. New.
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE. By E. S. Roscoe. Illustrated by F. D. Bedford.
SUFFOLK. By W. A. Dutt. Illustrated by J. Wylie.
DERBYSHIRE. By J. C. Cox, LL.D., F.S.A. Illustrated by J. C. Wall.
THE NORTH RIDING OF YORKSHIRE. By J. E. Morris. Illustrated by R. J. S. Bertram.
HAMPSHIRE. By J. C. Cox. Illustrated by M. E. Purser.
SICILY. By F. H. Jackson. With many Illustrations by the Author.
*DORSET. By Frank R. Heath. Illustrated.
*CHESHIRE. By W. M. Gallichan. Illustrated by Elizabeth Hartley.

Little Library, The

With Introductions, Notes, and Photogravure Frontispieces.

Small Pott 8vo. Each Volume, cloth, 1s. 6d. net; leather, 2s. 6d. net.

A series of small books under the above title, containing some of the famous works in English and other literatures, in the domains of fiction, poetry, and belles lettres. The series also contains volumes of selections in prose and verse.

The books are edited with the most sympathetic and scholarly care. Each one contains an introdnction which gives (1) a short biography of the author; (2) a critical estimate of the book. Where they are necessary, short notes are added at the foot of the page.

Each volume has a photogravure frontispiece, and the books are produced with great care.

ENGLISH LYRICS, A LITTLE BOOK OF. Anon.
PRIDE AND PREJUDICE. By Jane Austen. Edited by E. V. Lucas. *Two Volumes.*
NORTHANGER ABBEY. By Jane Austen. Edited by E. V. Lucas.
THE ESSAYS OF LORD BACON. Edited by Edward Wright.
THE INGOLSBY LEGENDS. By R. H. Barham. Edited by J. B. Atlay. *Two Volumes.*
A LITTLE BOOK OF ENGLISH PROSE. Edited by Mrs. P. A. Barnett.
THE HISTORY OF THE CALIPH VATHEK. By William Beckford. Edited by E. Denison Ross.
SELECTIONS FROM WILLIAM BLAKE. Edited by M. Perugini.
LAVENGRO. By George Borrow. Edited by F. Hindes Groome. *Two Volumes.*
THE ROMANY RYE. By George Borrow. Edited by John Sampson.
SELECTIONS FROM THE EARLY POEMS OF ROBERT BROWNING. Edited by W. Hall Griffin, M.A.
SELECTIONS FROM THE ANTI-JACOBIN; with George Canning's additional Poems. Edited by Lloyd Sanders.
THE ESSAYS OF ABRAHAM COWLEY. Edited by H. C. Minchin.
SELECTIONS FROM GEORGE CRABBE. Edited by A. C. Deane.
JOHN HALIFAX GENTLEMAN. By Mrs. Craik. Edited by Annie Matheson. *Two Volumes.*
THE ENGLISH POEMS OF RICHARD CRAWSHAW. Edited by Edward Hutton.
THE INFERNO OF DANTE. Translated by H. F. Cary. Edited by Paget Toynbee, M.A., D.Litt.
THE PURGATORIO OF DANTE. Translated by H. F. Cary. Edited by Paget Toynbee, M.A. D.Litt.

THE PARADISO OF DANTE. Translated by H. F. Cary. Edited by Paget Toynbee, M.A., D.Litt.
SELECTIONS FROM THE POEMS OF GEORGE DARLEY. Edited by R. A. Streatfeild.
A LITTLE BOOK OF LIGHT VERSE. Edited by A. C. Deane.
MARRIAGE. By Susan Ferrier. Edited by Miss Goodrich Freer and Lord Iddesleigh. *Two Volumes.*
THE INHERITANCE. By Susan Ferrier. Edited by Miss Goodrich Freer and Lord Iddesleigh. *Two Volumes.*
CRANFORD. By Mrs. Gaskell. Edited by E. V. Lucas. *Second Edition.*
THE SCARLET LETTER. By Nathaniel Hawthorne. Edited by Percy Dearmer.
A LITTLE BOOK OF SCOTTISH VERSE. Edited by T. F. Henderson.
POEMS. By John Keats. With an Introduction by L. Binyon and Notes by J. MASEFIELD.
EOTHEN. By A. W. Kinglake. With an Introduction and Notes. *Second Edition.*
ELIA, AND THE LAST ESSAYS OF ELIA. By Charles Lamb. Edited by E. V. Lucas.
LONDON LYRICS. By F. Locker. Edited by A. D. Godley, M.A.
A reprint of the First Edition.
SELECTIONS FROM LONGFELLOW. Edited by L. M. Faithfull.
THE POEMS OF ANDREW MARVELL. Edited by E. Wright.
THE MINOR POEMS OF JOHN MILTON. Edited by H. C. BEECHING, M.A.
MANSIE WAUCH. By D. M. Moir. Edited by T. F. Henderson.
A LITTLE BOOK OF ENGLISH SONNETS. Edited by J. B. B. Nichols.
THE MAXIMS OF LA ROCHEFOUCAULD. Translated by Dean Stanhope. Edited by G. H. Powell.
REJECTED ADDRESSES. By Horace and James Smith. Edited by A. D. Godley, M.A.
A SENTIMENTAL JOURNEY. By Laurence Sterne. Edited by H. W. Paul.
THE EARLY POEMS OF ALFRED, LORD TENNYSON. Edited by J. Churton Collins, M.A.
IN MEMORIAM. By Alfred, Lord Tennyson. Edited by H. C. Beeching, M.A.
THE PRINCESS. By Alfred, Lord Tennyson. Edited by Elizabeth Wordsworth.
MAUD. By Alfred, Lord Tennyson. Edited by Elizabeth Wordsworth.
VANITY FAIR. By W. M. Thackeray. Edited by S. Gwynn. *Three Volumes.*
PENDENNIS. By W. M. Thackeray. Edited by S. Gwynn. *Three Volumes.*
ESMOND. By W. M. Thackeray. Edited by S. Gwynn.
CHRISTMAS BOOKS. By W. M. Thackeray. Edited by S. Gwynn.
THE POEMS OF HENRY VAUGHAN. Edited by Edward Hutton.
THE COMPLEAT ANGLER. By Izaak Walton. Edited by J. Buchan.
A LITTLE BOOK OF LIFE AND DEATH. Edited by Mrs. Alfred Waterhouse. *Sixth Edition.*
SELECTIONS FROM WORDSWORTH. Edited by Nowell C. Smith.
LYRICAL BALLADS. By W. Wordsworth and S. T. Coleridge. Edited by George Sampson.

Miniature Library, Methuen's

Reprints in miniature of a few interesting books which have qualities of humanity, devotion, or literary genius.

EUPHRANOR: A Dialogue on Youth. By Edward FitzGerald. From the edition published by W. Pickering in 1851. *Demy 32mo, Leather, 2s. net.*
POLONIUS: or Wise Saws and Modern Instances. By Edward FitzGerald. From the edition published by W. Pickering in 1852. *Demy 32mo. Leather, 2s. net.*
THE RUBAIYAT OF OMAR KHAYYAM. By Edward FitzGerald. From the 1st edition of 1859, *Second Edition. Leather, 2s. net.*
THE LIFE OF EDWARD, LORD HERBERT OF CHERBURY. Written by himself. From the edition printed at Strawberry Hill in the year 1764. *Medium 32mo. Leather, 2s. net.*
THE VISIONS OF DOM FRANCISCO QUEVEDO VILLEGAS, Knight of the Order of St. James Made English by R. L. From the edition printed for H. Herringman 1668. *Leather. 2s. net.*
POEMS. By Dora Greenwell. From the edition of 1848. *Leather, 2s. net.*

The Oxford Biographies

Fcap. 8vo. Each volume, cloth, 2s. 6d. net; leather, 3s. 6d. net.

These books are written by scholars of repute, who combine knowledge and literary skill with the power of popular presentation. They are illustrated from authentic material.

DANTE ALIGHIERI. By Paget Toynbee, M.A., D.Litt. With 12 Illustrations. *Second Edition.*
SAVONAROLA. By E. L. S. Horsburgh, M.A. With 12 Illustrations. *Second Edition.*
JOHN HOWARD. By E. C. S. Gibson, D.D., Vicar of Leeds. With 12 Illustrations.

TENNYSON. By A. C. BENSON, M.A. With 9 Illustrations.
WALTER RALEIGH. By I. A. Taylor. With 12 Illustrations.
ERASMUS. By E. F. H. Capey. With 12 Illustrations.
THE YOUNG PRETENDER. By C. S. Terry. With 12 Illustrations.
ROBERT BURNS. By T. F. Henderson. With 12 Illustrations.
CHATHAM. By A. S. M'Dowall. With 12 Illustrations.
ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. By Anna M. Stoddart. With 16 Illustrations.
CANNING. By W. A. Phillips. With 12 Illustrations.
BEACONSFIELD. By Walter Sichel. With 12 Illustrations.
GOETHE. By H. G. Atkins. With 12 Illustrations.

School Examination Series

Edited by A. M. M. STEDMAN, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

FRENCH EXAMINATION PAPERS. By A. M. M. Stedman, M.A. *Thirteenth Edition.*
A KEY, issued to Tutors and Private Students only to be had on application to the Publishers. *Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s. net.*
LATIN EXAMINATION PAPERS. By A. M. M. Stedman, M.A. *Twelfth Edition.*
KEY (*Fourth Edition*) issued as above. *6s. net.*
GREEK EXAMINATION PAPERS. By A. M. M. Stedman, M.A. *Seventh Edition.*
KEY (*Second Edition*) issued as above. *6s. net.*
GERMAN EXAMINATION PAPERS. By R. J. Morich. *Fifth Edition.*
KEY (*Second Edition*) issued as above. *6s. net.*
HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY EXAMINATION PAPERS. By C. H. Spence, M.A. *Second Edition.*
PHYSICS EXAMINATION PAPERS. By R. E. Steel, M.A., F.C.S.
GENERAL KNOWLEDGE EXAMINATION PAPERS. By A. M. M. Stedman, M.A. *Fourth Edition.*
KEY (*Third Edition*) issued as above. *7s. net.*
EXAMINATION PAPERS IN ENGLISH HISTORY. By J. Tait Plowden-Wardlaw, B.A.

Social Questions of To-day

Edited by H. DE B. GIBBINS, Litt.D., M.A. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

A series of volumes upon those topics of social, economic, and industrial interest that are foremost in the public mind.

Each volume is written by an author who is an acknowledged authority upon the subject with which he deals.

TRADE UNIONISM—NEW AND OLD. By G. Howell. *Third Edition.*
THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT TO-DAY. By G. J. Holyoake. *Fourth Edition.*
MUTUAL THRIFT. By J. Frome Wilkinson, M.A.
PROBLEMS OF POVERTY. By J. A. Hobson, M.A. *Fourth Edition.*
THE COMMERCE OF NATIONS. By C. F. Bastable, M.A. *Third Edition.*
THE ALIEN INVASION. By W. H. Wilkins, B.A.
THE RURAL EXODUS. By P. Anderson Graham.
LAND NATIONALIZATION. By Harold Cox, B.A.
A SHORTER WORKING DAY. By H. de Gibbins and R. A. Hadfield.
BACK TO THE LAND. An Inquiry into Rural Depopulation. By H. E. Moore.
TRUSTS, POOLS, AND CORNERS. By J. Stephen Jeans.
THE FACTORY SYSTEM. By R. W. Cooke-Taylor.
THE STATE AND ITS CHILDREN. By Gertrude Tuckwell.
WOMEN'S WORK. By Lady Dilke, Miss Bulley, and Miss Whitley.
SOCIALISM AND MODERN THOUGHT. By M. Kauffmann.
THE PROBLEM OF THE UNEMPLOYED. By J. A. Hobson, M.A.
LIFE IN WEST LONDON. By Arthur Sherwell, M.A. *Third Edition.*
RAILWAY NATIONALIZATION. By Clement Edwards.
WORKHOUSES AND PAUPERISM. By Louisa Twining.
UNIVERSITY AND SOCIAL SETTLEMENTS. By W. Reason, M.A.

Technology, Textbooks of

Edited by PROFESSOR J. WERTHEIMER, F.I.C.

Fully Illustrated.

HOW TO MAKE A DRESS. By J. A. E. Wood. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.*
CARPENTRY AND JOINERY. By F. C. Webber. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
PRACTICAL MECHANICS. By Sidney H. Wells. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

PRACTICAL PHYSICS. By H. Stroud, D.Sc., M.A. *Crown* 8vo. 3s. 6d.
MILLINERY, THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL. By Clare Hill. *Second Edition. Crown* 8vo. 2s.
PRACTICAL CHEMISTRY. Part I. By W. French, M.A. *Crown* 8vo. *Second Edition.* 1s. 6d.
PRACTICAL CHEMISTRY. Part II. By W. French, M.A., and T. H. Boardman, M.A *Crown* 8vo. 1s. 6d.
TECHNICAL ARITHMETIC AND GEOMETRY. By C. T. Millis, M.I.M.E. *Crown* 8vo. 3s. 6d.
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF TEXTILE DESIGN. By Aldred F. Barker. *Demy* 8vo. 7s. 6d.
BUILDERS' QUANTITIES. By H. C. Grubb. *Crown* 8vo. 4s. 6d.
*METAL WORK (REPOUSSÉ). By A. C. Horth. *Crown* 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Theology, Handbooks of

Edited by R. L. OTTLEY, D.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology at Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

The series is intended, in part, to furnish the clergy and teachers or students of Theology with trustworthy Text-books, adequately representing the present position of the questions dealt with; in part, to make accessible to the reading public an accurate and concise statement of facts and principles in all questions bearing on Theology and Religion.

THE XXXIX. ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. Edited by E. C. S. Gibson, D.D. *Third and Cheaper Edition in one Volume. Demy* 8vo. 12s. 6d.
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION. By F. B. Jevons, M.A., Litt.D. *Third Edition. Demy* 8vo. 10s. 6d.
THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION. By R. L. Ottley, D.D. *Second and Cheaper Edition. Demy* 8vo. 12s. 6d.
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE CREEDS. By A. E. Burn, B.D. *Demy* 8vo. 10s. 6d.
THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA. By Alfred Caldecott, D.D. *Demy* 8vo. 10s. 6d.
A HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By J. F. Bethune Baker, M.A. *Demy* 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Methuen's Universal Library

EDITED BY SIDNEY LEE. *In Sixpenny Volumes.*

MESSRS. METHUEN are preparing a new series of reprints containing both books of classical repute, which are accessible in various forms, and also some rarer books, of which no satisfactory edition at a moderate price is in existence. It is their ambition to place the best books of all nations, and particularly of the Anglo-Saxon race, within the reach of every reader. All the great masters of Poetry, Drama, Fiction, History, Biography, and Philosophy will be represented. Mr. Sidney Lee will be the General Editor of the Library, and he will contribute a Note to each book.

The characteristics of METHUEN'S UNIVERSAL LIBRARY are five:—

1. SOUNDNESS OF TEXT. A pure and unabridged text is the primary object of the series, and the books will be carefully reprinted under the direction of competent scholars from the best editions. In a series intended for popular use not less than for students, adherence to the old spelling would in many cases leave the matter unintelligible to ordinary readers, and, as the appeal of a classic is universal, the spelling has in general been modernised.

2. COMPLETENESS. Where it seems advisable, the complete works of such masters as Milton Bacon, Ben Jonson and Sir Thomas Browne will be given. These will be issued in separate volumes, so that the reader who does not desire all the works of an author will have the opportunity of acquiring a single masterpiece.

3. CHEAPNESS. The books will be well printed on good paper at a price which on the whole is without parallel in the history of publishing. Each volume will contain from 100 to 350 pages, and will be issued in paper covers, Crown 8vo, at Sixpence net. In a few cases a long book will be issued as a Double Volume at One Shilling net.

4. CLEARNESS OF TYPE. The type will be a very legible one.

5. SIMPLICITY. There will be no editorial matter except a short biographical and bibliographical note by Mr. Sidney Lee at the beginning of each volume.

The volumes may also be obtained in cloth at One Shilling net, or in the case of a Double Volume at One and Sixpence net. Thus TOM JONES may be bought in a Double paper volume at One Shilling net, or in one cloth volume at 1s. 6d. net.

The Library will be issued at regular intervals after the publication of the first six books, all of which will be published together. Due notice will be given of succeeding issues. The orders

of publication will be arranged to give as much variety of subject as possible, and the volume composing the complete works of an author will be issued at convenient intervals.

These are the early Books, all of which are in the Press.

THE WORKS OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. In 10 volumes.
VOL. I.—The Tempest; The Two Gentlemen of Verona; The Merry Wives of Windsor; Measure for Measure; The Comedy of Errors.
VOL. II.—Much Ado About Nothing; Love's Labour's Lost; A Midsummer Nights' Dream; The Merchant of Venice; As You Like It.
VOL. III.—The Taming of the Shrew; All's Well that Ends Well; Twelfth Night; The Winter's Tale.
THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. By John Bunyan.
THE NOVELS OF JANE AUSTEN. In 5 volumes.
VOL. I.—Sense and Sensibility.
THE ENGLISH WORKS OF FRANCIS BACON, LORD VERULAM.
Vol. I.—Essays and Counsels and the New Atlantis.
THE POEMS AND PLAYS OF OLIVER GOLDSMITH.
ON THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. By Thomas à Kempis.
THE WORKS OF BEN JOHNSON. In about 12 volumes.
VOL. I.—The Case is Altered; Every Man in His Humour; Every Man out of His Humour.
THE PROSE WORKS OF JOHN MILTON.
VOL. I.—Eikonoklastes and The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates.
SELECT WORKS OF EDMUND BURKE.
Vol. I.—Reflections on the French Revolution
Vol. II.—Speeches on America.
THE WORKS OF HENRY FIELDING.
Vol. I.—Tom Jones. (Double Volume.)
Vol. II.—Amelia. (Double Volume.)
THE POEMS OF THOMAS CHATTERTON. In 2 volumes.
Vol. I.—Miscellaneous Poems.
Vol. II.—The Rowley Poems.
THE MEDITATIONS OF MARCUS AURELIUS. Translated by R. Graves.
THE HISTORY OF THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By Edward Gibbon. In 7 volumes.
The Notes have been revised by J. B. Bury, Litt.D.
THE PLAYS OF CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE.
Vol. I.—Tamburlane the Great; The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus.
Vol. II.—The Jew of Malta; Edward the Second; The Massacre at Paris; The Tragedy of Dido.
THE NATURAL HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES OF SELBORNE. By Gilbert White.
THE COMPLETE ANGLER. In 2 volumes.
Vol. I.—By Izaak Walton.
Vol. II.—Part 2, by Cotton, and Part 3 by Venables.
THE POEMS OF PERCY BYSSHE SHELLEY. In 4 volumes.
Vol. I.—Alastor; The Daemon of the World; The Revolt of Islam, etc.
THE WORKS OF SIR THOMAS BROWNE. In 6 volumes.
Vol. I.—Religio Medici and Urn Burial.
THE POEMS OF JOHN MILTON. In 2 volumes.
Vol. I.—Paradise Lost.
Vol. II.—Miscellaneous Poems and Paradise Regained.
HUMPHREY CLINKER. By T. G. Smollett.
SELECT WORKS OF SIR THOMAS MORE.
Vol. I.—Utopia and Poems.
THE ANALOGY OF RELIGION, NATURAL AND REVEALED. By Joseph Butler, D.D.
ON HUMAN UNDERSTANDING. By John Locke. In 3 volumes.
THE POEMS OF JOHN KEATS. In 2 volumes.
THE DIVINE COMEDY OF DANTE. The Italian Text edited by Paget Toynbee, M.A., D.Litt. (A Double Volume.)

Westminster Commentaries, The

General Editor, WALTER LOCK, D.D., Warden of Keble College, Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis in the University of Oxford.

The object of each commentary is primarily exegetical, to interpret the author's meaning to the present generation. The editors will not deal, except very subordinately, with questions of textual criticism or philology; but, taking the English

text in the Revised Version as their basis, they will try to combine a hearty acceptance of critical principles with loyalty to the Catholic Faith.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. Edited with Introduction and Notes by S. R. Driver, D.D. *Third Edition Demy 8vo.* 10s. 6d.

THE BOOK OF JOB. Edited by E. C. S. Gibson. D.D. *Second Edition. Demy 8vo.* 6s.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Edited by R. B. Rackham, M.A. *Demy 8vo. Second and Cheaper Edition.* 10s. 6d.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS. Edited by H. L. Goudge, M.A. *Demy 8vo.* 6s.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES. Edited with Introduction and Notes by R. J. Knowling, M.A. *Demy 8vo.* 6s.

PART II.—FICTION

Marie Corelli's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. *each.*

A ROMANCE OF TWO WORLDS. *Twenty-Fifth Edition.*

VENDETTA. *Twenty-First Edition.*

THELMA. *Thirty-First Edition.*

ARDATH: THE STORY OF A DEAD SELF. *Fifteenth Edition.*

THE SOUL OF LILITH. *Twelfth Edition.*

WORMWOOD. *Fourteenth Edition.*

BARABBAS: A DREAM OF THE WORLD'S TRAGEDY. *Thirty-Ninth Edition.*

'The tender reverence of the treatment and the imaginative beauty of the writing have reconciled us to the daring of the conception. This "Dream of the World's Tragedy" is a lofty and not inadequate paraphrase of the supreme climax of the inspired narrative.'—*Dublin Review.*

THE SORROWS OF SATAN. *Forty-Eighth Edition.*

'A very powerful piece of work. . . . The conception is magnificent, and is likely to win an abiding place within the memory of man. . . . The author has immense command of language, and a limitless audacity. . . . This interesting and remarkable romance will live long after much of the ephemeral literature of the day is forgotten. . . . A literary phenomenon . . . novel, and even sublime.'—W. T. STEAD in the *Review of Reviews.*

THE MASTER CHRISTIAN. [165*th Thousand.*

'It cannot be denied that "The Master Christian" is a powerful book; that it is one likely to raise uncomfortable questions in all but the most self-satisfied readers, and that it strikes at the root of the failure of the Churches—the decay of faith—in a manner which shows the inevitable disaster heaping up . . . The good Cardinal Bonpré is a beautiful figure, fit to stand beside the good Bishop in "Les Misérables." It is a book with a serious purpose expressed with absolute unconventionality and passion . . . And this is to say it is a book worth reading.'—*Examiner.*

TEMPORAL POWER: A STUDY IN SUPREMACY. [150*th Thousand.*

'It is impossible to read such a work as "Temporal Power" without becoming convinced that the story is intended to convey certain criticisms on the ways of the world and certain suggestions for the betterment of humanity. . . . If the chief intention of the book was to hold the mirror up to shams, injustice, dishonesty, cruelty, and neglect of conscience, nothing but praise can be given to that intention.'—*Morning Post.*

GOD'S GOOD MAN: A SIMPLE LOVE STORY. *Sixth Edition.*

Anthony Hope's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. *each.*

THE GOD IN THE CAR. *Tenth Edition.*

'A very remarkable book, deserving of critical analysis impossible within our limit; brilliant, but not superficial; well considered, but not elaborated; constructed with the proverbial art that conceals, but yet allows itself to be enjoyed by readers to whom fine literary method is a keen pleasure.'—*The World.*

A CHANGE OF AIR. *Sixth Edition.*

'A graceful, vivacious comedy, true to human nature. The characters are traced with a masterly hand.'—*Times.*

A MAN OF MARK. *Fifth Edition.*

'Of all Mr. Hope's books, "A Man of Mark" is the one which best compares with The Prisoner of Zenda."'—*National Observer.*

THE CHRONICLES OF COUNT ANTONIO. *Fifth Edition.*

'It is a perfectly enchanting story of love and chivalry, and pure romance. The Count is the most constant, desperate, and modest and tender of lovers, a peerless gentleman, an intrepid fighter, a faithful friend, and a magnanimous foe.'—*Guardian.*

PHROSO. Illustrated by H. R. MILLAR. *Sixth Edition.*

'The tale is thoroughly fresh, quick with vitality, stirring the blood.'—*St. James's Gazette.*

SIMON DALE. Illustrated. *Sixth Edition.*

'There is searching analysis of human nature, with a most ingeniously constructed plot. Mr. Hope has drawn the contrasts of his women with marvellous subtlety and delicacy.'—*Times.*

THE KING'S MIRROR. *Fourth Edition.*

'In elegance, delicacy, and tact it ranks with the best of his novels, while in the wide range of its portraiture and the subtilty of its analysis it surpasses all his earlier ventures.'—*Spectator.*

QUISANTE. *Fourth Edition.*

'The book is notable for a very high literary quality, and an impress of power and mastery on every page.'—*Daily Chronicle.*

THE DOLLY DIALOGUES.

W. W. Jacobs' Novels

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

MANY CARGOES. *Twenty-Seventh Edition.*

SEA URCHINS. *Eleventh Edition.*

A MASTER OF CRAFT. Illustrated. *Sixth Edition.*

'Can be unreservedly recommended to all who have not lost their appetite for wholesome laughter.'—*Spectator.*

'The best humorous book published for many a day.'—*Black and White.*

LIGHT FREIGHTS. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition.*

'His wit and humour are perfectly irresistible. Mr. Jacobs writes of skippers, and mates, and seamen, and his crew are the jolliest lot that ever sailed.'—*Daily News.*

'Laughter in every page.'—*Daily Mail.*

Lucas Malet's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

COLONEL ENDERBY'S WIFE. *Third Edition.*

A COUNSEL OF PERFECTION. *New Edition.*

LITTLE PETER. *Second Edition.* 3s. 6d.

THE WAGES OF SIN. *Fourteenth Edition.*

THE CARISSIMA. *Fourth Edition.*

THE GATELESS BARRIER. *Fourth Edition.*

'In "The Gateless Barrier" it is at once evident that, whilst Lucas Malet has preserved her birthright of originality, the artistry, the actual writing, is above even the high level of the books that were born before.'—*Westminster Gazette.*

THE HISTORY OF SIR RICHARD CALMADY. *Seventh Edition.* A Limited Edition in Two Volumes. *Crown 8vo.* 12s.

'A picture finely and amply conceived. In the strength and insight in which the story has been conceived, in the wealth of fancy and reflection bestowed upon its execution, and in the moving sincerity of its pathos throughout, "Sir Richard Calmady" must rank as the great novel of a great writer.'—*Literature.*

'The ripest fruit of Lucas Malet's genius. A picture of maternal love by turns tender and terrible.'—*Spectator.*

'A remarkably fine book, with a noble motive and a sound conclusion.'—*Pilot.*

Gilbert Parker's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

PIERRE AND HIS PEOPLE. *Fifth Edition.*

'Stories happily conceived and finely executed. There is strength and genius in Mr Parker's style.'—*Daily Telegraph.*

MRS. FALCHION. *Fifth Edition.*

'A splendid study of character.'—*Athenæum.*

THE TRANSLATION OF A SAVAGE. *Second Edition.*

THE TRAIL OF THE SWORD. Illustrated. *Eighth Edition.*

'A rousing and dramatic tale. A book like this is a joy inexpressible.'—*Daily Chronicle.*

WHEN VALMOND CAME TO PONTIAC: The Story of a Lost Napoleon. *Fifth Edition.*

'Here we find romance—real, breathing, living romance. The character of Valmond is drawn unerringly.'—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

AN ADVENTURER OF THE NORTH: The Last Adventures of 'Pretty Pierre.' *Third Edition.*

'The present book is full of fine and moving stories of the great North.'—*Glasgow Herald.*

THE SEATS OF THE MIGHTY. Illustrated. *Thirteenth Edition.*

'Mr. Parker has produced a really fine historical novel.'—*Athenæum.*

'A great book.'—*Black and White.*

THE BATTLE OF THE STRONG: a Romance of Two Kingdoms. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition.*

'Nothing more vigorous or more human has come from Mr. Gilbert Parker than this novel.'—*Literature.*

THE POMP OF THE LAVILETTES. *Second Edition.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

'Unforced pathos, and a deeper knowledge of human nature than he has displayed before.'—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

Arthur Morrison's Novels

Crown 8*vo.* 6*s. each.*

TALES OF MEAN STREETS. *Sixth Edition.*

'A great book. The author's method is amazingly effective, and produces a thrilling sense of reality. The writer lays upon us a master hand. The book is simply appalling and irresistible in its interest. It is humorous also; without humour it would not make the mark it is certain to make.'—*World.*

A CHILD OF THE JAGO. *Fourth Edition.*

'The book is a masterpiece.'—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

TO LONDON TOWN. *Second Edition.*

'This is the new Mr. Arthur Morrison, gracious and tender, sympathetic and human.'—*Daily Telegraph.*

CUNNING MURRELL.

'Admirable. . . Delightful humorous relief . . . a most artistic and satisfactory achievement.'—*Spectator.*

THE HOLE IN THE WALL. *Third Edition.*

'A masterpiece of artistic realism. It has a finality of touch that only a master may command.'—*Daily Chronicle.*

'An absolute masterpiece, which any novelist might be proud to claim.'—*Graphic.*

'"The Hole in the Wall" is a masterly piece of work. His characters are drawn with amazing skill. Extraordinary power.'—*Daily Telegraph.*

Eden Phillpotts' Novels

Crown 8*vo.* 6*s. each.*

LYING PROPHETS.

CHILDREN OF THE MIST. *Fifth Edition.*

THE HUMAN BOY. With a Frontispiece. *Fourth Edition.*

'Mr. Phillpotts knows exactly what school-boys do, and can lay bare their inmost thoughts; likewise he shows an all-pervading sense of humour.'—*Academy.*

SONS OF THE MORNING. *Second Edition.*

'A book of strange power and fascination.'—*Morning Post.*

THE STRIKING HOURS. *Second Edition.*

'Tragedy and comedy, pathos and humour, are blended to a nicety in this volume.'—*World.*

'The whole book is redolent of a fresher and ampler air than breathes in the circumscribed life of great towns.'—*Spectator.*

THE RIVER. *Third Edition.*

'"The River" places Mr. Phillpotts in the front rank of living novelists.'—*Punch.*

'Since "Lorna Doone" we have had nothing so picturesque as this new romance.'—*Birmingham Gazette.*

'Mr. Phillpotts's new book is a masterpiece which brings him indisputably into the front rank of English novelists.'—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

'This great romance of the River Dart. The finest book Mr. Eden Phillpotts has written.'—*Morning Post.*

THE AMERICAN PRISONER. *Third Edition.*

THE SECRET WOMAN. *Second Edition.*

S. Baring-Gould's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

ARMINELL. *Fifth Edition.*
URITH. *Fifth Edition.*
IN THE ROAR OF THE SEA. *Seventh Edition.*
CHEAP JACK ZITA. *Fourth Edition.*
MARGERY OF QUETHER. *Third Edition.*
THE QUEEN OF LOVE. *Fifth Edition.*
JACQUETTA. *Third Edition.*
KITTY ALONE. *Fifth Edition.*
NOÉMI. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition.*
THE BROOM-SQUIRE. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition.*
DARTMOOR IDYLLS.
THE PENNYCOMEQUICKS. *Third Edition.*
GUAVAS THE TINNER. Illustrated. *Second Edition.*
BLADYS. Illustrated. *Second Edition.*
DOMITIA. Illustrated. *Second Edition.*
PABO THE PRIEST.
WINIFRED. Illustrated. *Second Edition.*
THE FROBISHERS.
ROYAL GEORGIE. Illustrated.
MISS QUILLET. Illustrated.
LITTLE TU'PENNY. *A New Edition.* 6*d.*
CHRIS OF ALL SORTS.
IN DEWISLAND. *Second Edition.*

Robert Barr's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

IN THE MIDST OF ALARMS. *Third Edition.*
'A book which has abundantly satisfied us by its capital humour.'—*Daily Chronicle.*
THE MUTABLE MANY. *Second Edition.*
'There is much insight in it, and much excellent humour.'—*Daily Chronicle.*
THE VICTORS.
THE COUNTESS TEKLA. *Third Edition.*
'Of these mediæval romances, which are now gaining ground, "The Countess Tekla" is the very best we have seen.'—*Pall Mall Gazette.*
THE LADY ELECTRA. *Second Edition.*
THE TEMPESTUOUS PETTICOAT.

E. Maria Albanesi's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

SUSANNAH AND ONE OTHER. *Fourth Edition.*
THE BLUNDER OF AN INNOCENT. *Second Edition.*
CAPRICIOUS CAROLINE. *Second Edition.*
LOVE AND LOUISA. *Second Edition.*
PETER, A PARASITE.

B. M. Croker's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

ANGEL. *Fourth Edition.*
PEGGY OF THE BARTONS. *Sixth Edit.*
THE OLD CANTONMENT.
A STATE SECRET. *Third Edition.*
JOHANNA. *Second Edition.*
THE HAPPY VALLEY. *Second Edition.*

J. H. Findlater's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

THE GREEN GRAVES OF BALGOWRIE. *Fifth Edition.*

Mary Findlater's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s.

A NARROW WAY. *Third Edition.*
OVER THE HILLS.
THE ROSE OF JOY. *Second Edition.*

Robert Hichens' Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

THE PROPHET OF BERKELEY SQUARE. *Second Edition*
TONGUES OF CONSCIENCE. *Second Edition.*
FELIX. *Fourth Edition.*
THE WOMAN WITH THE FAN. *Fifth Edition.*
BYEWAYS. 3*s.* 6*d.*
THE GARDEN OF ALLAH *Seventh Edition.*

Henry James's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

THE SOFT SIDE. *Second Edition.*
THE BETTER SORT.
THE AMBASSADORS. *Second Edition.*
THE GOLDEN BOWL.

Mary E. Mann's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

OLIVIA'S SUMMER. *Second Edition.*
A LOST ESTATE. *A New Edition.*
THE PARISH OF HILBY. *A New Edition.*
*THE PARISH NURSE.
GRAN'MA'S JANE.
MRS. PETER HOWARD.
A WINTER'S TALE. *A New Edition.*
ONE ANOTHER'S BURDENS. *A New Edition.*
THERE WAS ONCE A PRINCE. Illustrated. 3s. 6d.
WHEN ARNOLD COMES HOME. Illustrated. 3s. 6d.

W. Pett Ridge's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

LOST PROPERTY. *Second Edition.*
ERB. *Second Edition.*
A SON OF THE STATE. 3s. 6d.
A BREAKER OF LAWS. 3s. 6d.
MRS. GALER'S BUSINESS.
SECRETARY TO BAYNE, M.P. 3s. 6d.

Adeline Sergeant's Novels

Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

THE MASTER OF BEECHWOOD.
BARBARA'S MONEY. *Second Edition.*
ANTHEA'S WAY.
THE YELLOW DIAMOND. *Second Edition.*
UNDER SUSPICION.
THE LOVE THAT OVERCAME.
THE ENTHUSIAST.
ACCUSED AND ACCUSER. *Second Edition.*
THE PROGRESS OF RACHEL.
THE MYSTERY OF THE MOAT.

Albanesi (E. Maria). See page 35.
Anstey (F.), Author of 'Vice Versâ.' A BAYARD FROM BENGAL. Illustrated by BERNARD PARTRIDGE. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.
Bacheller (Irving), Author of 'Eben Holden.' DARREL OF THE BLESSED ISLES *Third Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6s.
Bagot (Richard). A ROMAN MYSTERY. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6s.
Balfour (Andrew). See Shilling Novels.
Baring-Gould (S.). See page 35 and Shilling Novels.
Barlow (Jane). THE LAND OF THE SHAMROCK. *Crown 8vo.* 6s. See also Shilling Novels.
Barr (Robert). See page 35 and Shilling Novels.
Begbie (Harold). THE ADVENTURES OF SIR JOHN SPARROW. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
Belloc (Hilaire). EMMANUEL BURDEN, MERCHANT. With 36 Illustrations by G. K. CHESTERTON. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6s.
Benson (E. F.). See Shilling Novels.
Benson (Margaret). SUBJECT TO VANITY. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.
Besant (Sir Walter). See Shilling Novels.
Bowles (C. Stewart). A STRETCH OFF THE LAND. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
Bullock (Shan. F.). THE SQUIREEN. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
THE RED LEAGUERS. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
See also Shilling Novels.
Burton (J. Bloundelle). THE YEAR ONE: A Page of the French Revolution. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
THE FATE OF VALSEC. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
A BRANDED NAME. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
See also Shilling Novels.
Capes (Bernard), Author of 'The Lake of Wine.' THE EXTRAORDINARY CONFESSIONS OF DIANA PLEASE. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo.* 6s.
Chesney (Weatherby). THE BAPTST RING. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.
THE TRAGEDY OF THE GREAT EMERALD. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

THE MYSTERY OF A BUNGALOW. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Clifford (Hugh). A FREE LANCE OF TO-DAY. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Clifford (Mrs. W. K.). See also Shilling Novels and Books for Boys and Girls.
Cobb (Thomas). A CHANGE OF FACE. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Cobban (J. Maclaren). See Shilling Novels.
Corelli (Marie). See page 32.
Cotes (Mrs. Everard). See Sara Jeannette Duncan.
Cotterell (Constance). THE VIRGIN AND THE SCALES. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Crane (Stephen) and **Barr (Robert).** THE O'RUDDY. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Crockett (S. R.), Author of 'The Raiders,' etc. LOCHINVAR. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE STANDARD BEARER. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Croker (B. M.). See page 35.
Dawson (A. J.). DANIEL WHYTE. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Doyle (A. Conan), Author of 'Sherlock Holmes,' 'The White Company,' etc. ROUND THE RED LAMP. *Ninth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Duncan (Sara Jeannette) (Mrs. Everard Cotes). THOSE DELIGHTFUL AMERICANS. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE POOL IN THE DESERT. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
A VOYAGE OF CONSOLATION. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Findlater (J. H.). See page 35 and Shilling Novels.
Findlater (Mary). See page 35.
Fitzpatrick (K.) THE WEANS AT ROWALLAN. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Fitzstephen (Gerald). MORE KIN THAN KIND. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Fletcher (J. S.). LUCIAN THE DREAMER. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
DAVID MARCH. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Francis (M. E.). See Shilling Novels.
Fraser (Mrs. Hugh), Author of 'The Stolen Emperor.' THE SLAKING OF THE SWORD. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gallon (Tom), Author of 'Kiddy.' RICKERBY'S FOLLY. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gerard (Dorothea), Author of 'Lady Baby.' THE CONQUEST OF LONDON. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
HOLY MATRIMONY. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
MADE OF MONEY. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE BRIDGE OF LIFE. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gerard (Emily). THE HERONS' TOWER. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gissing (George), Author of 'Demos,' 'In the Year of Jubilee,' etc. THE TOWN TRAVELLER. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE CROWN OF LIFE. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Glanville (Ernest). THE INCA'S TREASURE. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Gleig (Charles). BUNTER'S CRUISE. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Goss (C. F.). See Shilling Novels.
Gerbertson (Agnes G.). PATIENCE DEAN. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gichens (Robert). See page 35.
Gobbes (John Oliver), Author of 'Robert Orange.' THE SERIOUS WOOING. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gope (Anthony). See page 32.
Gough (Emerson). THE MISSISSIPPI BUBBLE. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gyne (C. J. Cutcliffe), Author of 'Captain Kettle.' MR. HORROCKS, PURSER. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gacobs (W. W.). See page 33.
Games (Henry). See page 36.
Ganson (Gustaf). ABRAHAM'S SACRIFICE. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Geays (H. A. Mitchell). HE THAT EATHETH BREAD WITH ME. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gawless (Hon. Emily). See Shilling Novels.
Gawson (Harry), Author of 'When the Billy Boils.' CHILDREN OF THE BUSH. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gevett-Yeats (S.). ORRAIN. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Ginden (Annie). A WOMAN OF SENTIMENT. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Ginton (E. Lynn). THE TRUE HISTORY OF JOSHUA DAVIDSON, Christian and Communist. *Twelfth Edition. Medium 8vo. 6d.*
Gong (J. Luther), Co-Author of 'The Darling of the Gods.' MADAME BUTTERFLY. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
GXTY JANE. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Gyall (Edna). DERRICK VAUGHAN, NOVELIST. *42nd Thousand. Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

M'Carthy (Justin H.), Author of 'If I were King.' THE LADY OF LOYALTY HOUSE. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE DRYAD. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Mackie (Pauline Bradford). THE VOICE IN THE DESERT. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Macnaughtan (S.). THE FORTUNE OF CHRISTINA MACNAB. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Malet (Lucas). See page 33.
Mann (Mrs. M. E.). See page 36.
Marriott (Charles), Author of 'The Column. GENEVRA. *Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6s.*
Marsh (Richard). THE TWICKENHAM PEERAGE. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
A METAMORPHOSIS. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
GARNERED. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
A DUEL. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Mason (A. E. W.), Author of 'The Courtship of Morrice Buckler,' 'Miranda of the Balcony, etc. CLEMENTINA. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. Second Edition. 6s.*
Mathers (Helen), Author of 'Comin' thro' the Rye.' HONEY. *Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
GRIFF OF GRIFFITHSCOURT. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Meade (L. T.). DRIFT. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
RESURGAM. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Meredith (Ellis). HEART OF MY HEART. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
'Miss Molly' (The Author of). THE GREAT RECONCILER. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Mitford (Bertram). THE SIGN OF THE SPIDER. Illustrated. *Sixth Edition Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
IN THE WHIRL OF THE RISING. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE RED DERELICT. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Montresor (F. F.), Author of 'Into the Highways and Hedges.' THE ALIEN. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Morrison (Arthur). See page 34.
Nesbit (E.). (Mrs. E. Bland). THE RED HOUSE. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE LITERARY SENSE. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Norris (W. E.). THE CREDIT OF THE COUNTY. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE EMBARRASSING ORPHAN. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
NIGEL'S VOCATION. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
LORD LEONARD THE LUCKLESS. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
BARHAM OF BELTANA. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Oliphant (Mrs.). See Shilling Novels.
Ollivant (Alfred). OWD BOB, THE GREY DOG OF KENMUIR. *Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Oppenheim (E. Phillips). MASTER OF MEN. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Oxenham (John), Author of 'Barbe of Grand Bayou.' A WEAVER OF WEBS. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE GATE OF THE DESERT. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Pain (Barry). THREE FANTASIES. *Crown 8vo. 1s.*
LINDLEY KAYS. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Parker (Gilbert). See page 23.
Pemberton (Max). THE FOOTSTEPS OF A THRONE. Illustrated. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
I CROWN THEE KING. With Illustrations by Frank Dadd and A. Forrestier. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Penny (Mrs. F. E.). See Shilling Novels.
Phillpotts (Eden). See page 34 and Shilling Novels.
Pickthall (Marmaduke). SAID THE FISHERMAN. *Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
*BRENDLE. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
***Pryce (Richard).** WINIFRED MOUNT. *A New Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
'Q,' Author of 'Dead Man's Rock.' THE WHITE WOLF. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Queux (W. le). THE HUNCHBACK OF WESTMINSTER. *Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE CLOSED BOOK. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE VALLEY OF THE SHADOW. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Rhys (Grace). THE WOOING OF SHEILA. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE PRINCE OF LISNOVER. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Rhys (Grace) and Another. THE DIVERTED VILLAGE. With Illustrations by DOROTHY GWYN JEFFREYS. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Ridge (W. Pett). See page 36.
Ritchie (Mrs. David G.). THE TRUTHFUL LIAR. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Roberts (C. G. D.). THE HEART OF THE ANCIENT WOOD. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Robertson (Frances Forbes). THE TAMING OF THE BRUTE. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Russell (W. Clark). MY DANISH SWEETHEART. Illustrated. *Fourth Edition Crown 8vo. 6s.*
ABANDONED. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
HIS ISLAND PRINCESS. Illustrated. *Crown 6vo. 6s.*
Sergeant (Adeline). See page 36.
Shannon (W. F.). THE MESS DECK. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
IM TWELVES. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
Sonnichsen (Albert). DEEP SEA VAGABONDS. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Stringer (Arthur). THE SILVER POPPY. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Sutherland (Duchess of). See Shilling Novels.
Swan (Annie). See Shilling Novels.
Tanqueray (Mrs. B. M.). THE ROYAL QUAKER. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Thompson (Vance). SPINNERS OF LIFE. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Traineman (Paul). BY A FINNISH LAKE. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE SONG OF THE FOREST. *Crown 8vo. 6s.* See also Shilling Novels.
Watson (H. B. Marriott). ALARUMS AND EXCURSIONS. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
CAPTAIN FORTUNE. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Wells (H. G.) THE SEA LADY. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Weyman (Stanley), Author of 'A Gentleman of France.' UNDER THE RED ROBE With Illustrations by R. C. WOODVILLE. *Eighteenth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
White (Stewart E.). Author of 'The Blazed Trail.' CONJUROR'S HOUSE. A Romance of the Free Trail. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
White (Percy). THE SYSTEM. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Williamson (Mrs. C. N.), Author of 'The Barnstormers.' PAPA. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE ADVENTURE OF PRINCESS SYLVIA. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
THE WOMAN WHO DARED. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE SEA COULD TELL. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE CASTLE OF THE SHADOWS. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*
Williamson (C. N. and A. M.). THE LIGHTNING CONDUCTOR: Being the Romance of a Motor Car. Illustrated. *Tenth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*
THE PRINCESS PASSES. Illustrated. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Methuen's Shilling Novels

Cloth, 1s. net.

ENCOURAGED by the great and steady sale of their Sixpenny Novels, Messrs. Methuen have determined to issue a new series of fiction at a low price under the title of 'METHUEN'S SHILLING NOVELS.' These books are well printed and well bound in *cloth*, and the excellence of their quality may be gauged from the names of those authors who contribute the early volumes of the series.

Messrs. Methuen would point out that the books are as good and as long as a six shilling novel, that they are bound in cloth and not in paper, and that their price is One Shilling *net*. They feel sure that the public will appreciate such good and cheap literature, and the books can be seen at all good booksellers.

The first volumes are—

Adeline Sergeant. A GREAT LADY.
Richard Marsh. MARVELS AND MYSTERIES.
Tom Gallon. RICKERBY'S FOLLY.
H. B. Marriott-Watson. THE SKIRTS OF HAPPY CHANCE.
Sullock (Shan F.). THE BARRYS.
THE CHARMERS.
Essing (George). THE CROWN OF LIFE.
Francis (M. E.). MISS ERIN.
Sutherland (Duchess of). ONE HOUR AND THE NEXT.
Urton (J. Bloundelle). ACROSS THE SALT SEAS.
Viphant (Mrs.). THE PRODIGALS.
Walfour (Andrew). VENGEANCE IS MINE.

Barr (Robert), Author of 'The Countess Tekla.' THE VICTORS.
Penny (Mrs. F. A.). A MIXED MARRIAGE.
Hamilton (Lord Ernest). MARY HAMILTON.
Glanville (Ernest). THE LOST REGIMENT.
Benson (E. F.), Author of 'Dodo.' THE CAPSINA.
Goss (C. F.). THE REDEMPTION OF DAVID CORSON.
Findlater (J. H.), Author of 'The Green Graves of Balgowrie.' A DAUGHTER OF STRIFE.
Cobban, (J. M.). THE KING OF ANDAMAN.
Clifford (Mrs. W. K.). A WOMAN ALONE.
Phillpotts (Eden). FANCY FREE.

Books for Boys and Girls.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE GETTING WELL OF DOROTHY. By Mrs. W. K. Clifford. Illustrated by Gordon-Browne. *Second Edition.*
THE ICELANDER'S SWORD. By S. Baring-Gould.
ONLY A GUARD-ROOM DOG. By Edith E. Cuthell.
THE DOCTOR OF THE JULIET. By Harry Collingwood.
LITTLE PETER. By Lucas Malet. *Second Edition.*
MASTER ROCKAFELLAR'S VOYAGE. By W. Clark Russell.
THE SECRET OF MADAME DE MONLUC. By the Author of "Mdlle. Mori."
SYD BELTON: Or, the Boy who would not go to Sea. By G. Manville Fenn.
THE RED GRANGE. By Mrs. Molesworth.
A GIRL OF THE PEOPLE. By L. T. Meade.
HEPSY GIPSY. By L. T. Meade. 2s. 6d.
THE HONOURABLE MISS. By L. T. Meade.

The Novels of Alexandre Dumas.

Price 6d. Double Volume, 1s.

THE THREE MUSKETEERS. With a long Introduction by Andrew Lang. Double volume.
THE PRINCE OF THIEVES. *Second Edition.*
ROBIN HOOD. A Sequel to the above.
THE CORSICAN BROTHERS.
GEORGES.
CROP-EARED JACQUOT; JANE; Etc.
TWENTY YEARS AFTER. Double volume.
AMAURY.
THE CASTLE OF EPPSTEIN.
THE SNOWBALL, and SULTANETTA.
CECILE; OR, THE WEDDING GOWN.
ACTÉ.
THE BLACK TULIP.
THE VICOMTE DE BRAGELONNE.
Part I. Louis de la Vallière. Double Volume.
Part II. The Man in the Iron Mask. Double Volume.
THE CONVICT'S SON.
THE WOLF-LEADER.
NANON; OR, THE WOMEN'S WAR. Double volume.
PAULINE; MURAT; AND PASCAL BRUNO.
THE ADVENTURES OF CAPTAIN PAMPHILE.
FERNANDE.
GABRIEL LAMBERT.
THE REMINISCENCES OF ANTONY.
CATHERINE BLUM.
THE CHEVALIER D'HARMENTAL.
SYLVANDIRE.
THE FENCING MASTER.
*CONSCIENCE.
*THE REGENT'S DAUGHTER. A Sequel to Chevalier d'Harmental.

Illustrated Edition.

THE THREE MUSKETEERS. Illustrated in Colour by Frank Adams. 2s. 6d.
THE PRINCE OF THIEVES. Illustrated in Colour by Frank Adams. 2s.
ROBIN HOOD THE OUTLAW. Illustrated in Colour by Frank Adams. 2s.
THE CORSICAN BROTHERS. Illustrated in Colour by A. M. M'Lellan. 1s. 6d.
FERNANDE. Illustrated in Colour by Munro Orr.
THE BLACK TULIP. Illustrated in Colour by A. Orr.
GEORGES. Illustrated in Colour by Munro Orr. 2s.
TWENTY YEARS AFTER. Illustrated in Colour by Frank Adams. 3s.
AMAURY. Illustrated in Colour by Gordon Browne. 2s.
THE SNOWBALL, and SULTANETTA. Illustrated in Colour by Frank Adams. 2s.
*THE VICOMTE DE BRAGELONNE. Part I. Illustrated in Colour by Frank Adams.
*CROP-EARED JACQUOT; JANE; Etc. Illustrated in Colour by Gordon Browne.
*THE CASTLE OF EPPSTEIN. Illustrated in Colour by Stewart Orr.
*ACTÉ. Illustrated in Colour by Gordon Browne.
*CECILE; OR, THE WEDDING GOWN. Illustrated in Colour by D. Murray Smith.
*THE ADVENTURES OF CAPTAIN PAMPHILE. Illustrated in Colour by Frank Adams.
*THE WOLF-LEADER. Illustrated in Colour by Frank Adams. 1s. 6d.

THE BOUND TO PLEASE
Heckman Bindery INC.
FEB. 65
N. MANCHESTER, INDIANA